

THE,
WESTMINSTER
REVIEW

JULY TO DECEMBER.

(*INCLUSIVE*)

1889.

"Faith can never be confirmed enough
Though doubts did ever sleep."

SHAKESPEARE

Wahrheitsliebe zeigt sich darin, daß man überall das Gute zu finden und zu schätzen weiß.

GoTHE.

VOL. CXXXII.

LONDON:
TRÜBNER & CO., LUDGATE HILL.
MDCCCLXXXIX.

O. 2 WE S
Vol 139

Ballantyne Press
BALLANTYNE, HANSON AND CO.
LONDON AND EDINBURGH

Ottawa Public Library

Acq. No.

7850

Date 2.8.72

INDEX.

- AGNOSTICISM, 148
- Agriculture, The Progress of, and the Decline of Small Farming, 192
- An Abortive French Revolution, 1
- Army, The United States. By Cecil Logsdail, 427
- Australia, The Labour Question in. By Jeannie Lockett, 617
- CARLYLE'S PHILOSOPHY OF HISTORY. By Lewis G. Janes, U.S.A., 411
- DAWN (THE) OF CREATION; OR, THE GENESIS OF THE ELEMENTS. By Farnham Maxwell Lyte, 190
- Diderot, 231
- Dramatic Recitation. By F. E. Marshall Steele, 530
- Drummond, Thomas, 377
- EDUCATION QUESTION, THE PRESENT POSITION OF THE, 480
- Eight Hours' Movement, Some Economic Aspects of the, 44
- Empire, Ireland and the. By J. A. Partridge, 449
- Evolution of Man, The Natural. By A. Dewar, 519
- FRENCH REVOLUTION, AN ABORTIVE, 1
- GIORDANO BRUNO: HIS LIFE AND PHILOSOPHY. By C. E. Plumptre, 117
- HOME AFFAIRS, 106, 213, 323, 538, 655
- Home Rule and Imperial Federation, 225
- Home Rule for Scotland. By B. D. Mackenzie, 553
- Humanitarianism. By H. S. Salt, 74
- INDIAN CONGRESS, LORD DUFFERIN AND THE. By Uma Sankar Misra, M A., 92
- In Donegal, 97
- In Donegal: A Reply, 315
- In Donegal: A Rejoinder. By Elizabeth Maityn, 635
- Ireland and the Empire. By J. A. Partridge, 449
- Irish Question, A French View of the, 138
- JOB, A NEW READING OF THE BOOK OF, 56
- LAND, HOW TO NATIONALIZE THE. By F. L. Soper, 270
- Land, The National Administration of the. By F. L. Soper, 362
- Labour (The) Question in Australia. By Jeannie Lockett, 617
- Liberalism Philosophically Considered, 337
- Liberty (The) of the Subject (Female). By N. Arling, 157

MIRACLES. By the Rev. Walter Lloyd, 168

Miracles and Doctrine. By the Rev. Walter Lloyd, 394

Motley's Correspondence, 26

NATURALISM, 185

New (The) Round Table. By Andrew Reid, Lady Robinson, Sir Walter Foster, M.P., Lord Monkswell, the Right Hon. Earl of Ashburnham, W. J. Evelyn, and the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, M.P., 506

New (The) Round Table. By the Right Hon. J. G. Shaw-Lefevre, M.P., A. Brand Winterbotham, M.P., the Hon. Bernard Coleridge, M.P., John Page Hopps, J. Seymour Keay, M.P., and Lord Brassey, 624

POLITICS, WORKMEN AND. By Henry Rose, 581

RECITATION, DRAMATIC. By F. E. Marshall Steele, 530

Religion (The) of Rome during the Third Century, 247

Religions, The Secret History of. By the Rev. Walter Lloyd, 566

Russell, The Life of Lord John, 594

Russian (The) Peasantry. By J. A. Partridge, 286

SCOTLAND, HOME RULE FOR. By B. D. Mackenzie, 553

Scottish Universities Commission, The Work before the. By Scotus Academicus, 404

Secret (The) History of Religions. By the Rev. Walter Lloyd, 566

Secondary Education, The Present Position of, 16

Shakespeare, William, Gentleman. By Cecil W. Franklyn, 348

Socialism, Practicable. By A. R. Neuman, 307

Some Economic Aspects of the Eight Hours' Movement, 44

TIMOLEON, THE LIBERATOR OF SICILY, 470

Tzar-Tyrant, or Tzar-Tribune ! By Sheridan Ford, 204

UNITED STATES ARMY. By Cecil Logsdail, 427

WOMEN IN PUBLIC LIFE. By D. F. Hannigan and Elizabeth Martyn, 279

Workmen and Politics. By Henry Rose, 581

AN ABORTIVE FRENCH REVOLUTION.

It was the mistake of Burke, and the first critics of the French Revolution; to regard that tragic event as a sudden explosion of unprovoked wickedness. If they ever recognized the existence of mediæval struggles against privilege, they looked upon them as so many regrettable incidents, happily terminated by the vigour of the ruling classes. It never occurred to them that such a crisis as that of 1789 must needs have been heralded by premonitory symptoms.

"The writers of the *ancien régime*," says M. Martin, "misled by prejudice, and without experience of revolutions, understood neither the events of the fourteenth century nor the character of its men." These tribunes and their history represent, in fact, a movement that was wholesome, however premature. We are interested, on the occasion of the anniversary of their ultimate fulfilment, in asking what made their efforts abortive at the time; though, perhaps, the epithet "abortive" is too strong: Europe, after their day, was never again what it had been at any earlier date. But there was evidently something in mediæval Europe which rendered the movement of the Third Estate untimely and incapable of immediate victory, although that Estate was far in advance of anything that had existed in what—for want of a better name—we must continue to call Ancient Societies.

The Republics of the world before Christ were by no means instances of pure democracy. The Greeks, from whom the word is borrowed, hardly knew the thing itself, in our modern meaning. In their little communities, it is true, the free citizens met, voted, and transacted other—even judicial—business. But they did all this actually and in person, without either representative deputies or delegated officials. And there was a large mass of subordinate and servile population who did not possess this somewhat irksome franchise, but had only, for their part, to obey. In the early days of Rome there were constant troubles caused by disputes between the descendants of the original founders—the *populus*—and the descendants of later settlers—the *plebs*. Nowhere do we find, in those so-called free communities, that denial of privilege which—taught originally by the Codes of the Emperors—was to fall into inactivity in the Western world in the ruin of the Empire, and only revive at the end of the Eighteenth Century. In the interval the masses remained—

as in the old Republics—a semi-hostile or wholly hostile force, encamped, so to speak, beyond the walls, which they lacked the strength, rather than the will, to besiege and batter down.

The substratum of modern society, since 1789, is no longer what it was then. In some States the hostile proletariat has been enfranchised, endowed with all the attributes of citizenship, and brought within the scope of universal primary education. In others the privileged and unprivileged continue to co-exist, but in relations that are felt to be precarious. Even under the Roman Empire, with its universality of civic rights, there was in most of the cities—notably in Rome itself—a body of clients and a body of *capite censi*, the latter tending to become no better than *lazzaroni*, yet having the rights of citizens, something like our own “unemployed.” In modern society there are, generally, two divisions of the urban commons: first, the minor *bourgeoisie*—retail traders and skilled urban artisans—who long preserved in their municipalities some of the traditions of the old Roman world; in mediæval—and even in more recent—times this class has been in many countries contemned and compressed by the aristocracy, but has managed to grow in power, by its own resources, often aided by the favour of the crown. In our own time the *bourgeois* has enemies of a different kind, the mob orators and philosophers, who hold him up to scorn as the foe of “the people” and the bar to genuine progress.

Secondly, and in place of the class which under the Roman Emperor got its bread and games by way of hush-money from the State, we find in many modern countries a mass of poor, precariously fed and generally uninstructed, with a still lower deposit of utter paupers under all. It is this “sixth century,” or proletarian class, by whose aid the *bourgeoisie* destroyed the old system in France. Without that alliance it forms the chief danger in unreformed modern societies, where its numbers are still, as Carlyle has said, struggling like those of a buried Euceladus: a prisoned Titan, stirring in the dark, under the weight of superincumbent social mountains. It was not, indeed, by such upheavals that the Roman Empire was overthrown. After preliminary orgies of crime, its degraded proletariat sank, lower and lower, to become ever more miserable and helpless; and the State owed its final fall to its inability to resist the attacks of external barbarism. But modern Europe has its barbarisms too: not coming from far, but here already; all the unendowed and unenlightened, who contemplate comfort and riches in which they have no share, and whose passions are kept aglow by the knowledge that they can only share by becoming wreckers. Political reform is achieved, from time to time, but not *tali auxilio*: in truly progressive societies one class after another may arise to demand an extension of power or a removal of privilege: some of these claims are not enforced without evil of a temporary and

transitory kind. But the true test and justification of such movements are to be found in their ultimate success. The enfranchised classes join the organization of civic life: prosperity is diffused: levels of achievement become more accessible: peace is firmer and sweeter than before. No such results, however, mark the blind revolts of mere brute force. Instead of the rain-storm and the river-flood, followed by redistribution of landmarks, with increased fertility, these can only yield a convulsive eruption of mud and lava, turning field and garden into arid ruin and wilderness, and laying low the monuments of art and skill. Such is the contrast between the two kinds of political change—the one hot, hasty, capable of some ultimate good, perhaps, but certainly doing much present mischief; the other gradual, deliberate, utilizing the past for the development of the future.

The great, but usually inert, force of the uninstructed is often set in motion by agitators, who by no means share the ignorance of their followers. This fact accounts for the dislike and fear which the name of "agitator" excites in the mind of the average citizen: a ludicrous instance of which used to be related in connection with the late Daniel O'Connell. The story went that a young English tourist, visiting Derrynane Abbey with a letter of introduction, was hospitably invited to dinner. He found a number of guests at the table, each of whom, when he had occasion to address the host, called him "Mr. Liberator." It was before the introduction of Russian table service, and the stranger had taken his seat, before which reposed a roast turkey. In a pause of talk, he wished to make himself useful, and incautiously offered to carve. Puzzled by the name, and thinking of the different way in which he was accustomed to hear O'Connell spoken of at home, he flurriedly exclaimed, "Mr. Agitator, shall I send you some turkey?" The Kerry men looked furious, and a scene appeared imminent, when the host, with great tact and good humour, and purposely intensifying his brogue, made the following reply:—"Whether I am an Agitator, sir, or whether I am a Liberator, at any rate I am a turkey-ater, and I'll trouble ye for a slice." Indeed there are agitators of another kind than those demagogues who hound on a mob to violence, and perhaps O'Connell is now, generally and deservedly, felt to have been of the better sort. We may discern both the agitator of the mob and the leader of the more enlightened among the French precursors of the fourteenth century. In the succeeding generation a partially similar movement occurred among the English, but in the English case the co-operation of the enlightened is not to be observed. The rising of Kent and Essex, which goes by the name of Wat Tyler, was definite and reasonable in comparison with that of the French peasantry, but it lacked the support which the latter derived from the townspeople, and, instead of a provost of merchants

endeavouring to restrain the proletarian movement and use it for constitutional reform, we had a Mayor of London, alarmed for his own property, striking down an unresisting petitioner. Pretending, or imagining, that they had countenance from the king's uncle, these poor people had, in fact, no influential guides. Hence the Government was able, with the aid of an aristocratic Parliament, to annul the promises that had been made to them in the hour of their brief success. If a similar discomfiture appeared to follow the movement of the French reformers, the discomfiture was more apparent than real; the very ferocity of the repression gave the movement force. It was suspended, and, after a long and profound agitation, it swelled into a cataclysm which completely destroyed the old social fabric. The tribunes of mediæval France, however, and the sessions of the States-General which they inspired, passed away without any immediate fruit, and the movements of the peasants was still more short-lived. The gradual diminution of aristocratic privilege was left to be effected by other hands:—Louis II. and Richelieu, and the Grand Monarch, all helped to prepare the removal of inequality. The States-General ceased to assemble after 1614. Nevertheless, the work of those early reformers left its trace as a tradition in the popular mind, and served as a stimulus and a model; unhappily the doings of rural violence did the same; and, whether for evil or for good, the democratic movement of the mediæval French was reproduced in 1789. When the power of the nobility had been destroyed, only leaving immunities and advantages for which no equivalent was forthcoming, the decrepit monarchy found itself face to face with a misgoverned people led by a middle class that had never forgotten the lessons of history. Yet the movement of that class, in the fourteenth century, having been so premature, the good cause was thrown back in France in a much greater degree than was the case in England. Descended from the Gallo-Romans, and clinging to the civilization of Rome and to the municipal institutions which formed the concrete record of that civilization, the French burghers paid dear for their enlightenment, and generations of them had to see their hopes of freedom unfulfilled. When, at last, they were saved, it was so as by fire.

The social and political life of modern Europe is commonly supposed to have begun with the Renaissance, that march of mind which ensued upon the fall of the Byzantine Empire. But, in truth, it had begun more than one hundred years earlier. Chaucer, Dante, Wyclif are all modern, for modern history begins with the appearance of free thought, free art, self-government in towns, and a mercantile community. Symptoms of the new order are visible in the fourteenth century in the shape of guilds and grammar schools, vernacular literature, and a paid soldiery. Yet, contemporaneous with these there were remnants of the dark ages, the robber baron,

the tortured Hebrew, and a mass of miserable serfs in the rural villages, of whom it is wonderful that they thought life worth preserving at all. These unwholesome features, however, may, on closer inspection, perhaps prove to have been the necessary consequence of the imperfect amalgamation of Northern conquest with the previous Roman civilization. Thus, what appears at first sight an unaccountable effort against law and order will turn out to have been only part of the struggle of Roman civilization, when sunk into weakness and decay, vainly contending against the barbarians. Ancient Gaul had become completely Romanized from the time of Augustus Cæsar. The land was either held in *latifundia*, originating in benefices bestowed on men of influence, who parcelled it out among their dependents on the tenure known as *emphyteusis*, or else it belonged to joint communities, such as ecclesiastical or civil corporations. When the country gradually came under the power of the invading Franks the land would naturally change hands. Estates belonging to corporations would tend to become allodial—the term is of Teutonic origin—and those larger tracts forming benefices of the Romanized chiefs would naturally grow into the feudal system. Such domains as the latter would continue indivisible, and would be tilled by the subjugated population, while the allodial holdings, on the other hand, being constantly subject to partition, would be in the hands of a weak but ever-multiplying class, tending towards the status of villeinage. Thus, when the kingly power began to consolidate under Philip Augustus, there was a sort of muffled hostility towards feudalism on the part of a Celtic peasantry, nursing traditional claims to the land, and bound in meshes of copyhold. In the cities, meanwhile, the enmity was more open, if less deadly. By the help of their walls, and a certain unity of thought and habit, the citizens had continued to resist the invaders, and the necessities of the case combined with unforgotten Roman traditions to maintain a certain amount of municipal organization.

Upon these precarious institutions of mediæval France broke the storm of the English invasion. Already consolidated by community of blood and of language, the English of those days worked with a unity for which the French noblesse, leading an enslaved people, was no match. Beaten down at Crécy, and with many chiefs taken and held as security, for ransom, that noblesse was in evil case. Its prestige had been greatly lowered by that first victory of the numerically inferior army of the enemy, largely recruited by plebeians: Froissart declares that 100,000 men on the French side were conquered by 40,000 English. Mainly owing to the steady courage and good shooting of the English long-bowmen, the French were defeated, losing 30,000 of their number, including the flower of their chivalry. Then followed the equally disastrous day of Poitiers, when a French army of 60,000 strong was utterly routed by 14,000 English and

Gascons, the king and one of his sons being taken captive, together with many leaders of royal or noble blood. These aristocratic failures not only exposed the noblesse to the contempt of their unprivileged compatriots, but they also showed the latter a standard of plebeian self-assertion amongst a neighbouring people. And this noblesse, which was unable to defend the country, was now appealing to the country to ransom its chiefs from captivity.

This matter of ransom was an almost intolerable burden. In earlier times, when the soldier served without pay, he lived by booty, and appropriated not merely the chattels of the conquered but their persons also. As manners began to soften chivalry became a kind of mystic tie; and it was recommended by courtesy and cupidity alike that presumably solvent enemies should, if possible, be taken alive, and allowed to recover freedom by payment of money. And now the king and his noble followers were demanding the most extravagant sums on this account from the miserable vassals and villeins on their lands.

Thus the decay of feudal omnipotence had already begun under the first Valois kings. When the peasantry, always feeling their allodial claims, saw that their usurping masters were powerless to protect the country, and were at the same time draining almost the last dregs of its resources to redeem the results of their own imbecility, it may be supposed that democratic ideas received a formidable impulse, even though the time was not ripe for their realization. There were, indeed, no less than three forces acting in this direction. The peasantry, blind and dumb as a power, would have done little of themselves, but the weakness of the Crown had raised a dangerous schemer in the royal family itself; while the discontents and aspirations of the middle class were represented by a clerical lawyer, Robert Lecoq, and by the still more energetic Etienne Marcel, Provost of the merchants of Paris. Of these leaders the first was by far the least respectable. This was "Charles the Bad," King of Navarre, who was a claimant to the throne by virtue of his descent from Louis Hutin. On the imprisonment in England of King John, a Regency was attempted by his son Charles, Duke of Normandy; but the Navarrese, short of stature, and not distinguished as a soldier, began to intrigue with the burghers in the northern and eastern towns, doubtless for purely selfish ends. In fact, he aspired to play the very part which was taken in Bourbon times by some of the princes of the House of Orleans. More sincere and public-spirited by far was Marcel; morally, and almost actually, master of the city of Paris, even then a restless and turbulent place.

Already, before the defeat of Poitiers, King John, in straits for money, had summoned the States-General; and the meeting of 1335 is noted as one of the first that had been held since the Commons

had been recognized as an Estate.¹ It now turned out that they formed the only one of the orders which knew anything of business. A rough reform of finance was introduced. Charles the Bad, resisting this change, was arrested and imprisoned. The overthrow and captivity of the king followed. The revenue of the impoverished country failed; and the feeble Regency remained without any resource but the adulteration of the currency. That rude expedient proving insufficient to furnish funds for even the semblance of an administration, it was determined to convene the States once more.

The States assembled at Paris in the famous Convent of the Cordeliers, to become better known in the events of four centuries later as the meeting place of a revolutionary club. The nobility, headed by the "lords of the fleur-de-lys," or princes of the blood, appeared crestfallen and without prestige; and the clergy, nominally presided over by the Archbishop of Rouen, but really sympathizing with the Commons under the influence of Lecoq, who had become Bishop of the important see of Laon. There were in all 800 deputies, of whom half were from the third estate; and, this number proving too large for convenient despatch of business, a Committee of 80 was appointed. In this the orders were mixed, but the Commons preponderated, as was shown by the result; for a report was prepared by the Committee, on the receipt of which the States drew up a Petition of Rights, which went into the most practical details, and virtually involved an assertion of popular sovereignty.

"Il ne s'agit de rien moins que de transférer le gouvernement, législation, et administration dans les mains d'une espèce de Sénat tiré des trois ordres" (Martin, vi. 163). The States-General of 1355 had already provided that the taxes were to be collected and expended under their own control. The crown appears to have been held out to tempt Charles of Navarre: but he was to be a constitutional king. In the continuation of the *Chr. de Nangis* we find the very phrase, "la volonté du peuple." As Thierry says of Marcel: "This échevin of the 14th century by a remarkable anticipation designed and attempted things which seem to belong only to recent revolutions . . . circumstances resembled those of our own century." We have not only only a forecast of the National Assemblies, but of the position of Egalité, and of the subsequent action of his son at the end of the reign of Charles X. It was also in Marcel's time that blue and red became the popular blazon, afterwards to be united with white, in the famous tricolour cockade and flag of 1789. This surprising

¹ When Philip the Fair quarrelled with the Pope, he thought it well to appeal to the whole of his subjects for support. The peasantry were not reckoned among the enfranchised class; but the burghers were included. In the Assembly of 1302 the Tiers Etats made its first political appearance, the representatives of "the good towns" being added to the old National Council, which had consisted only of deputies of the clergy and the noblesse. Three other sessions were held between that date and 1355.

anticipation of modern changes took place in the autumn of 1356; and, could it only have been permanently established by a precedent noblesse and a general population worthy of the *bourgeoisie*, would have made France a strong and prosperous nation long since.

The States, however, soon dissolved: the nobility and clergy were not in earnest; the peasants were sunk in savagery; and it was left to Marcel to work the reform as best he might without assistance. The removal of unpopular Ministers, the release of the Navarrese (who was in prison all the winter), and the maintenance of the standard of currency were all pressed by this untiring man; in February 1357 another session took place, in which the business again devolved on the burgher order, and chiefly on the deputies of Paris. In March the States once more separated, leaving affairs in the hands of a standing commission of thirty-six. From various causes all these efforts broke down ultimately; the Dauphin would not allow Marcel's party to govern, could not do so himself; the country fell into anarchy; the King of Navarre was got out of prison, and played against the Regency; Marcel stained his cause by murdering two of the Marshals; Lecoq retired to his bishopric. Such was what Thierry has called the "premature attempt at hastening the designs of Providence," and "the mirror of the bloody changes through which those designs were destined to advance to their accomplishment." Stripped of mystic phrase, such were the first steps—apparently, but not really, fruitless—of that grand process by which European society is still being remodelled. For the ideas formulated by Marcel and his party, though abrogated at the time, became permanent traditions of the educated Commons; and their ultimate accomplishment, after a lapse of more than four hundred years, has given to the inhabitants of French towns, especially to Paris, that intelligent paramountship which—with many faults—is still exerted for the general benefit of the country. The traditions of the time never died. In 1413 the deputies presented a statement of grievances, and the poets Deschamps and Chartier took up the popular cause. In 1428 and 1468 the States reiterated their claims for reform. So late as 1565 the name of Marcel was still conjured up, when a pamphleteer, writing against the Guises, said that none who bore that patronymic would ever endure the rule of foreigner, "were it an Italian, Englishman, Scot, or of Lorraine."

Far other has been the fortune of the lower stratum of the Third Estate, the unlettered peasantry and the labourers of the towns. No leader of their movements has left a name, save the generic and ill-omened one of "Jacques Bonhomme." When the fair land of France was, in our own days, trampled under the feet of foreign invaders, no serviceable echo came from that class to the brave voices sounding from Paris, Tours, or Bordeaux. Naturally, it was no better when Marcel, betrayed by his royal, noble, and clerical

associates, turned in his desperation to this political force, blind, and, because blind, terrible and untrustworthy.

In the tract formerly known as "the Isle of France" one of the chief districts was that of which Beauvais was the capital. In ancient Gaul this region was known as a settlement of the Belgæ, and called—perhaps from one of their tribes—the land of Bellovacum, afterwards modified into Beauvoisis. The town of Beauvais, only thirteen leagues north of Paris, was old even at the time with which we are dealing; and the still unfinished cathedral even then soared one hundred and fifty feet into the air, the glory of Gothic architecture. Already, at the end of the eleventh century, when that part of Europe was still in the gloom of the dark ages, the burghers of Beauvais had formed a *commune*, with a firmly conceived charter. All round them stood the castles of seigneurs descended from the Frank invaders; but the burghers had bound themselves to do "justice against the men of the castles, and on the lord's property or on his retainers." (See the charter in Masson's *Medieval France*, p. 51.) This municipality was still in existence, and sympathized warmly with its powerful neighbour the commune of Paris. More than a century later it was to defend itself against Charles the Bold, and to drive away his army of 80,000 men in baffled retreat.

In the spring of 1358 the King of Navarre was preparing to receive the government at Paris from the hands of Marcel, while the Regent had gone off to Compiègne alarmed by the violence of the Parisians.¹ Here he held a mutilated Session of the States, in which neither Paris nor many other constituencies were represented. Nevertheless, imperfect as it was, the new assembly adhered to most of the old demands for reform, though cancelling the powers of the thirty-six, and evincing active hostility to the commune of Paris. That body, on the other hand, prepared for defence. The Navarrese and Bishop Lecoq were both co-operating with Marcel, and the university undertook to plead with the Dauphin; but the latter refused to condone the death of the Marshals. At this moment, when war appeared imminent between the feudalists and the burghers, a third champion descended into the arena. Already, in April, reports were heard of tumultuous assemblages in many of the manors of the Beauvoisis, and the bells of the parish churches were heard ringing in an unwonted manner. Before the end of May "certain humble people, *without a leader*, assembled together,"² of whom there were

¹ It was on this occasion that Marcel—who was to reap as he sowed—put to death two of the Dauphin's Ministers. In a letter, dated April 18th, he reproached the Dauphin for speaking of the Parisians as "villains," adding—not without point—"that the Parisians thought all those villains who did villainies, but did not hold themselves of that number." It was not the custom in those days to deal squeamishly with political adversaries; and Marcel, perhaps, expected no more than he gave.

² Esserent, Nointel, Chamoisie, and the neighbourhood of Clermont are named by the chronicler. The peasantry had learned to assemble in arms at the sound of the tocsin by having to repel attacks of "the companies," or soldier-brigands.

at first not a hundred [in any one place] ; and they said to each other that all the nobles, knights, and squires were dishonouring and betraying the kingdom ; and that it would be a good thing if all could be destroyed . . . and they had no arms but loaded clubs and knives . . . and soon they were six thousand ; and had all come together there might have been one hundred thousand. And, when they were asked why they did thus, they answered that they did not know ; but as they saw others doing, even the like did they." Thus far Froissart ; from whom, as the amiable celebrant of chivalric pageant and prowess, we are not to expect much sympathy with " Jacques Bonhomme." It has been, however, surmised that there is here a point of pity ; and that the courtly writer meant to intimate that Jacques was only doing as he was done by. On the whole a simpler interpretation seems more in keeping with his habits of observation, more keen than profound. Froissart means to illustrate what he considered the purposeless character of the Picard rising, as Thierry paraphrases him, " they were unable to give an account of the objects which they sought, or of the motive which impelled them : " if you asked them why they were wandering about in gangs with knives and clubs, they told you that they were doing like their neighbours, but they could not say why their neighbours did it. Nor can it be demonstrated that they were acting under burgher instigation, whether from Paris or Beauvais. They elected a cunning peasant from the village of Merlot to be their first leader : his name was Guillaume Calle, or Callet ; and under his guidance, after a few preliminary acts of arson, they spread themselves over the whole isle of France, the startled nobles flying before them with such mood as might be fancied in a tiger when a herd of cattle turns to bay. More than sixty strong places were destroyed in the neighbourhood of Beauvais and Amiens, more than a hundred in the Valois and Champagne. During May the Jacques marched over the country north and east of Paris, laying siege to the castles and country houses, battering and burning the buildings, slaying the inmates, and loading themselves with cloth of gold and rich armour. Terror became general among the classes by whom these hapless serfs had hitherto been looked upon as a peculiarly unprotected branch of the animal kingdom. No seigneur knew when it might not be his fate to be killed with torture, no fair châtelaine but might fear to meet a worse fate, and to linger out her life in degradation and captivity, the slave of slaves. The Duchess of Orleans had but time to escape from her castle of Beaumont when it was sacked : accompanied by the wife of the Regent and three hundred other ladies she took refuge in Meaux. Many of the burgher class now joined the insurrection, hoping to moderate its violence and direct it to good ends. Marcel sent them a contingent of three hundred armed Parisians ; but, failing to restrain the Jacques detached his party for a time, sending

them abroad separately, with orders to proclaim that no one was to destroy houses or to injure women or children of the noblesse, "on pain of forfeiting the friendship of the good town of Paris." Without positively breaking with the Jacques, he opened the gates of the city to all refugees of the feudal party who had not openly compromised themselves by crimes against the people. Calle led his followers to Compiègne. The Regent and the States were gone; and the citizens refused to admit the Jacques, who turned off to Senlis, in which town they obtained admittance. They now became masters of all the plain country between the Oise and the Seine, as far as Laon, Soissons, and Noyon. The towns began to sympathize generally: as for the burghers of Beauvais, they executed the decrees of the Jacques, who massacred many noble captives in the town and in the presence of the burghers. "The Mayor of Amiens sent a hundred of his people to the aid of the serfs" (*Flemish Chronicle*). Many of the Parisians, under a grocer named Pierre Gille, joined the peasant force, together with about five hundred who had assembled at Sillé, led by one Vaillant, Master of the Mint: there were rich men among them, says a chronicler, "bourgeois et autres." When this mixed force took the castle of Ermenonville they spared the governor on his declaring that he "abjured gentry and loved the burghers better than the knights." The combination of the townspeople was humanizing the movement: nothing seemed wanting to the completion of a social and political revolution but a successful blow, so struck as to convince the remaining towns of the North that they had nothing to lose by supporting the movement.¹

We have seen that a large body of ladies had taken refuge at Meaux. The townspeople there sympathized with the insurrection; but inside the city was a walled market-place, which had been lately fortified and garrisoned by orders of the Dauphin, Duke of Normandy, whose own wife was now one of those who benefited by the foresight of her lord. The Mayor and citizens, oppressed by the Duke's garrison, sent to Marcel for aid: and 10,000 Jacques, entering the city with the small Paris contingent, laid siege to the market.

The helpless ladies and their children, looking out of the windows of their narrow lodgings on those summer mornings, could see the swarms of armed peasants, clothed in the spoils of the *chateaux* and thronging the streets of the town. The citizens spread tables in the public places, and fed their wild adherents. The storm of the fortification was hourly expected. The lives, and all that was dearer still, of the helpless beings threatened by barbaric violence may well excite our

¹ A mitigated picture is given of these doings by Mérimée (*La Jacquerie*). The Jacques are there represented as organized by a monk, and led by English soldiers, who stimulate the peasants by dilating upon the comparative freedom and prosperity of the yeomanry of that country. A good deal of Mérimée's description is poetic: as Thierry shows, the Jacques were really a savage horde, with no special objects of their own.

pity, as it moved contemporaries. But, alas! there was much more at stake—namely, the future of the French people, which hung in the other scale. Now or never, did the Mint-master and grocer but know it!

The overthrow of the Jacques was no less sudden and unlooked for than had been their outbreak and first successes. While the peasant-hordes were fattening on the hospitality of the citizens of Meaux, and the feeble Parisian contingent was laying languid siege to the market-place, two Gascon knights were pricking over the undulating Burgundian country eager to strike a blow for the deliverance of the beleaguered ladies. These were Gaston, Count of Foix, and the Captal de Buch: neither of them what could be called earnest patriots or even good soldiers of France; rather, brilliant amateurs, full of the traditions of chivalry.¹ Early in the month of June they were at Châlons, where they heard of what was going on a hundred miles off at Meaux; for which place they instantly rode, followed by sixty mounted men-at-arms. As they approached the walls the garrison took heart, and sallied out of their fortification. Taken by surprise, and hemmed in on both sides, the Jacques—"black and little and very ill-armed"—made but a short resistance to the trained soldiery of the garrison and the armour-plated cavaliers. Some of the latter were slain, possibly by the Parisians; but the encounter was soon over. The Jacques were overthrown in heaps, says Froissart, and many leaped into the Marne. The conquerors rushed into the town, which they set on fire, slaughtering such of the inhabitants as they could seize. The Mayor was hanged. This was on the 9th June (O.S.), and decided the fate of the rising. A terrible reaction at once set in; during which—by contemporaneous testimony—the nobles of France did more harm to the kingdom than could have been caused by an English invasion. The details of murder, arson, and pillage are given in a later letter of Marcel's; and the Dauphin—afterwards distinguished as King Charles the Wise—corroborates the tale. "The nobles," he wrote, "ride from town to town, so that the men thereof have to flee to other places; and their houses are left empty, and all the goods of the country perish in the fields, and all heritages lie waste, uncultivated, and without use, &c. &c." The date of the Dauphin's despatch is in August; so that the reactionary havoc had already lasted twice as long as the whole outbreak of the Jacquerie. The Prince mentions no less than eight cities as having been sacked by the nobles; and the theatre of their fury was almost the whole of Languedoil.

The effect of the reaction was fatal to the immediate success of

¹ The Captal was a Gascon of what in Germany was known as the "Raubritter" class; he had sided with the English in his own country, and plundered the adjacent French territory. The two lords had been amusing themselves by acting with the Teutonic knights against the people of Lithuania.

the moderate reformers. The Regency found itself provided with an army, and with something like a cause. Deserted on all sides, Marcel was ruined and slain; Lecoq retired from public life; Charles of Navarre made his peace with the Government. Yet the true Third Estate was never again entirely suppressed. Even after the States-General had ceased to assemble the burghers continued to be a power, felt in the days of the League and of the Fronde, and even in those of Louis Quatorze. That ruler has usually derived his renown from his foreign policy, which was brilliant, indeed, but ultimately unsuccessful; he deserves a more unstinted praise for his good sense and firmness in providing a complete form of administration and laying the foundation of modern France. The spirit of his system was to further the approximation of classes. A competent man was not excluded from any career by mere accidents of birth. Once launched in public life there was nothing to hinder the distinguished commoner from entering the ranks of the noblesse. S. Simon, from his position of duke and peer, cites instances with scorn and anger. Such Ministers as Colbert, when trusted by the King, took precedence of all subjects save the princes of the blood alone. The ambition and intelligence of the *bourgeois* of that day receive mention from La Bruyère (*Car. c. ix.*), and the institution of the Académie (1637) must have aided the elevating process; both helping society to draw to the centre of the kingdom and fusing its various classes there. The cases of Voltaire and Beaumarchais exhibit the development a little later.

Yet the social disunion still continued to survive the raising of the level. The lower stratum of the Commons did not much benefit by the change. Unacademic but descriptive, Carlyle has shown, with bright play of light and shade, the miseries of the peasantry as witnessed by our countryman Arthur Young and other impartial observers.¹ Sumner Maine (*Early Law and Custom, c. ix.*) has abstracted the results drawn by modern French writers from the *cahiers* of the States-General, 1789. The overthrow of the nobility was due to the abrogation or absolescence of their political power. Luxurious and spendthrift absentees, they glittered at Versailles, while on their manors the toilers starved. The strength of the peasant, however, was not increased by the weakness of the noble: while he continued to pay, in money and in labour, the price of feudal protection, the peasant had ceased to receive even that incomplete equivalent. Nor would the privileged classes even bear their share in the general taxation of the country; and the attempt of Pontchartrain to restore the finances of Louis XV. by a graduated capitation failed mainly for that reason. The consequence was—as

¹ Chesterfield's remark, of December 1753, will be in most recollections: "The symptoms preceding great changes and revolutions in government exist and increase daily." See also authorities cited by Carlyle (*F. R. vi. 16*).

students of the great Revolution will know—the peasantry were already in revolt before the meeting of the last States-General. This modern Jacquerie has been fully described by M. Taine (*L'Anarchie Spontanée*), those outbreaks of rural vengeance called, collectively, the “burning of the châteaux.” All save the very wealthy nobles lived on feudal dues and money commutations of small incidental services, paid by what we should in England the “copyhold” tenants on their estates. The result of the controversy and litigation to which these claims had led was that a vast collection of title-deeds relating to fines and tenths, and such like taxes on industry, had come into the possession of the *seigneurs*. These were deposited, or believed to be deposited, in the muniment rooms of the manor houses; and the burning of the châteaux by which the great Revolution was preceded had for its principal motive the desire of the actual occupiers of the soil to destroy the evidence of so galling a servitude. Like all such movements it attained nothing. Copies of the documents, sometimes the very originals, existed in the courts of law and in the lawyers’ offices; and the system could only be abolished by abolishing the whole society in which it was framed. But for the subsequent work of the successive assemblies in Paris the enterprise must have failed of success. The only progress that the peasant had made in four centuries was this, that, instead of beginning with murder and ending with arson, he was ready to postpone murder until he had committed arson for what he thought legal ends. And his ends were ultimately gained, not by these crimes, but by the exertions of others.

It has been observed that the nearly contemporaneous movement in England was not nearly so permanent in its effects as that of Marcel and Lecoq in France; and this was because, though not so ferocious and blind as the Jacquerie, Wat Tyler’s followers found no sympathy among the middle classes. If ever a peasant rising deserved success, theirs surely was the one. But the working classes in England were to win their tardy way more gradually and by milder means. The gulf between social classes, the offensive advantages assumed by property and privilege, were slight in England compared to what they were in France. There was no sharp division between proletariat and patriciat. From the family round the crown to the smallest esquire or franklin who could show coat armour all gentlemen were equal. The lower classes for their part were independent, and for the most part prosperous. Soon after the loss of Normandy the knights and nobles became English, taking English wives and using their speech.¹ Then the grammar schools began to teach in English; and a still greater step towards union was taken when that language was allowed in Parliament and

¹ Witness the story of Morville, one of the Becket murderers, and the way in which he himself escaped assassination. *Temp. Henry II.*

An Abortive French Revolution.

the law courts. Among the inhabitants of cities and mercantile towns the movement was rapid. Guilds and crafts were organized, franchises and charters won: Edward III. himself became a member of the Armourers' Company. In the rural districts farmer and free labourer began to take the place of villain and serf; and the diminution of the people after the "Black Death" helped to strengthen the power and position of the survivors. But to all this the peasant risings made no contribution. At last came light. A popular literature arose, of which the best extant specimen, doubtless, is Langland's *Vision*. Creasy, remarking on another Ploughman of the same time, says that the popular poetry which has come down to us in fragments from the fourteenth century shows that the agriculturist had been adopted as the typical representative of political and religious purity. All this supposes hearers and readers demanding and relishing such compositions, and implies a far higher social level than that of "Jacques Bonhomme." The English peasant even had opinions of his own on religious matters; and it must have been for the use of Lollard readers that Wyclif produced his English Bible. It was the hostility of a Parliament of landlords and burghers that began poor Hodge's disappointment; nevertheless, his relief was eventually due to Parliamentary action. First came the Statute of 1351, in which the wages of labour were fixed, and an attempt was made to bind the labourer to the land. Then came the poll-tax, and then the peasant revolt of 1381, provoked by songs and leaflets, and contrasted with the Jacquerie by its abstinence from crime and its demand for justice. Sternly suppressed by the Parliamentary party, it produced no results. The attempts, indeed, of Parliament to withstand the enfranchisement of the serfs and the education of the commons' children, were both met by a royal veto.¹ The rest was accomplished by the dissolution of mediæval society in Europe, arising out of five hundred years' war. The English working man has had to emancipate himself by slow and painful efforts; but he has never again experienced temptations, either from his own helplessness or from the malice of his employers, strong enough to lead him into a general revolt. It is the interest of the people to be governed; if possible, well governed. A people like ours will not attack its rulers unless its very subsistence is in danger. It will be well for the French if the application be generally drawn from the present anniversary. With their quick intelligence and their fidelity to logical conclusions, they have sometimes overshot the times, and the premature political movements of their instructed classes have been too ready to accept the co-operation of classes more powerful from numbers than from knowledge.

¹ It was prayed that "nul naif ou vilein mette ses enfans, de ci en avant, a escoles pour eux avancer par clergie (*Parl. Rolls*; 1391, ap. Creasy). The words italicised show that the practice condemned was an old one.

HOW TO SYSTEMATIZE SECONDARY EDUCATION.

THE inadequacy of our secondary education, its want of organization, and the need of some authority by which it shall be directed have long been the subject of complaint among us. It is now twenty-one years since the Schools Enquiry Commission issued its voluminous report, but one only of the many recommendations made by it has been carried into effect. The Endowed Schools Commission and the Charity Commission, which succeeded to its duties in 1874, in the schemes framed by them for the administration of school endowments and of other endowments, the diversion of which to educational purposes was authorized by section 30 of the Endowed Schools Act, 1869, have done and are doing a very great deal to improve the condition of particular schools, and remedy the gross abuses to which educational trusts were formerly subject. Private enterprise and munificence, to which the existence of our secondary schools is almost entirely due, has done much in recent years to increase the number of institutions in which a good secondary education can be had, and to make Napoleon's desideratum of "*la carrière ouverte aux talens*" nearer attainment in England than it was. The great proprietary and professional schools and colleges, now ranking as public schools, Clifton, Haileybury, Wellington, Marlborough, Cheltenham, Rossall, Eastbourne, and Brighton, have all arisen within the last forty or fifty years; the high schools, established by the Boys' Public Day Schools Company, and by the Girls' Public Day Schools Company, are still more recent, and have attained for the most part a very marked success. The Woodard Schools and other Church of England schools, such as Bradfield and Radley, have filled other gaps, while the exhibitions to higher schools founded in connection with the London School Board, and with elementary schools at Portsmouth and other places, by private benevolence, have, like the schemes of the Endowed Schools and Charity Commissioners, done something at least to open out the benefits of secondary education to the clever poor boy; but in spite of all this the highest educational authority of to-day tells us that we have as yet done scarcely anything towards the creation of an organized system of secondary schools in England. Mr. Matthew Arnold, in one of the last papers he wrote, the article

on Schools, in Mr. Humphrey Ward's *Reign of Queen Victoria*, sums up the result of his life-long teaching as follows: "Whoever is not carried away by the torrent of jubilee, whoever has well observed our secondary schools and compared them with those of the Continent, knows indeed that we have broken up our old type of secondary instruction, but not yet founded a new one of any soundness and worth; that our provision of secondary schools is utterly incoherent and inadequate; that the local examinations supply us with neither the tests nor the supervision really requisite; that the bulk of the middle class in this country is worse educated than the corresponding class in Germany, Switzerland, Holland, Belgium, or even the United States; that it is brought up on an inferior plane, in schools both of lower standing and worse taught."

The indictment is to a great extent true, though it needs modifying in certain points. In the first place, although our schools are the result of private benevolence and enterprise, yet they date for the most part from a time when a great wave of educational enthusiasm swept over almost the whole country, and the consequence is that there are but few large towns throughout England which have not some provision in the way of endowment for secondary education, and but few country districts of twenty miles square within which some higher school may not be found. The differences in endowment between one school and another, and one district and another, are indeed enormous, varying from £1 15s. for every child of secondary school age in Rutlandshire to 1s. 4d. for each such child in Cornwall, and, if we include Wales in our inquiry, 5d. for each such child in Glamorganshire. But some kind of adjustment is not impossible, even under the present system, as the schemes of the Endowed Schools Branch of the Charity Commission provide, among other things, for a change in the site of a school and its endowments, as was decided very recently in the case of the Hemsworth Free Grammar School.¹ The schools are also under the present system subject to State supervision of a certain kind, since the schemes and amending schemes which the Charity Commission are empowered to make for their administration give frequent opportunity for the inspection of such schools by Government officials and for Governmental reports upon them. Assistant Charity Commissioners, appointed under the Charitable Trusts Acts of 1887, with the powers of inspectors appointed under the Charitable Trusts Acts 1853-69, may be and have been sent to different parts of the country to inspect schools, for which no scheme or amending scheme is in prospect. Yearly accounts, together with a copy of a report by an external examiner, are required by nearly every scheme to be sent in each year to the Commission. The examinations themselves are now conducted, perhaps, in a majority of cases, by a perfectly independent

¹ L.R. 12, App. Cas. 444.

and impartial Board of Examiners, in the case of higher secondary schools by the Oxford and Cambridge Schools Examination Board, in the case of lower secondary schools by the Delegates of Local Examinations or by the College of Preceptors. That the education is confined to the children of the upper and middle classes is true, no doubt, of most of the greatest and richest schools, but not of all, even of these. That they benefit mainly the middle classes is true of nearly all secondary schools, if in the middle classes we include the ranks of shopkeepers and higher artisans, but a larger number than is generally supposed of the very poorest work their way up from the public elementary schools by means of scholarships and exhibitions to the higher walks of learning. According to a return issued by the Charity Commission in 1885, in their thirty-first Report, as many as 1145 children from public elementary schools were at that time holding scholarships at secondary schools, but of the third grade only. The number is still miserably small compared with the number of children (somewhere about two millions) who leave our public elementary schools every year. In France we find in public secondary schools connected with the Académie de Paris alone over double this number of children from primary schools. The figures supplied by M. Gréard,¹ give a total of 2335, divided among thirty-six lycées and colleges.

It is also true that such scholarships exist at a comparatively few schools only. Some have not the necessary funds, some having funds are not administered under schemes which provide for such a use of them. This is, without doubt, one of the main points in which our secondary school system needs organizing, in order that a closer and more universal connection may be established between the public elementary and higher schools. A second point in which organization is required is in the proper distribution throughout the country of schools and school endowments. At present we find some counties and districts remarkably well off in this respect, while others still remain equipped most inadequately. Northumberland, for instance, in spite of the intelligence and progressiveness of its population, has no first grade school, and of second grade schools but six for boys and one for girls, the distance between some of these being very great. Some other manufacturing counties, like Cheshire and Staffordshire, are also behindhand, at least so far as endowment is concerned. As regards private schools there is so little information that it is impossible, as things are at present, to count upon them in investigating the educational machinery of the country.

A third point, in which the want of organization shows itself, is inspection. As we have said, a good deal of inspection has been done by the Endowed Schools Branch of the Charity Commission, but

¹ *Education et Instruction*, vol. i. p. 17.

hitherto almost entirely in connection with the framing of schemes and amending schemes for schools within their jurisdiction; although an inspection of a somewhat more general kind was begun by them last year in certain parts of the country. The external examiner, a report from whom is required to be sent in to the Charity Commission from most schools every year, is generally requested, in accordance with the scheme, to report upon the discipline as well as the studies of the school; but this requirement only goes to the question of discipline, while there are many other points which would properly come within an inspector's observation, such as the condition of the buildings, the hours of study, the methods of teaching, the adaptation of the school to the wants of the neighbourhood, the class of boys received in the school, and the incidence of the benefits of scholarships and exhibitions. Such powers of inspection the Charity Commission and their officers seem to have, either as incident to the framing or amending of schemes, or from the visitatorial office, which in many cases devolves upon them as representing the Crown, and in other cases can be conferred upon them by a clause introduced into a school scheme. Assistant Commissioners, appointed with the powers of inspectors, could hold local inquiries and supplement the examiner's report in the points mentioned. But the fact remains that such inspection as there is at present is only occasional, and that there is no such complete organization for the inspection of secondary schools as has long existed in the case of elementary schools.

Taking these three points—(1) the connection by scholarships and exhibitions of elementary with higher schools, (2) the proper distribution of schools and endowments, (3) inspection, as constituting together the main difference between organization and want of organization—we wish to make the following suggestions:—

1. As to the connection of elementary with higher schools.

A good deal has already been done by recent schemes to meet this want; how much, has hitherto depended upon the amount of endowment. We may take as our postulates—(1) That one at least out of every fifty children who leave the Board schools is worth an extended education of some kind or other, and at the same time unable to pay for it.¹ (2) That every secondary school could, except, perhaps, as regards fabric, be made, if it were really successful, self-supporting, and that the endowment might thus be mainly applied to the provision of scholarships and exhibitions. (3) That a child who is to go on to the higher branches of education should be caught young, and should not remain at a Board school beyond the age of ten or

¹ In the evidence before the Select Committee of 1866 on the Endowed Schools Acts, about a quarter of a million was given as the estimated number of children requiring secondary education, and this will give us a proportion of about one in ten. One in fifty of elementary school children between the ages of ten and fifteen will give us about 28,000 children in all, or a little more than a tenth of the number estimated in the above-mentioned evidence. This is the proportion of free scholars very commonly provided for in schemes framed by the Charity Commission.

eleven. (4) That a scholarship of £10 for five years will be on an average sufficient help to give children a fair start and enable them to fight their way for themselves in the path of life which they may choose. (5) That no fixed rule can be laid down to suit all cases, that help of a special kind will sometimes be needed, and that elasticity is the first requisite of a healthy organization.

Now the number of children (girls and boys) between the ages of 10 and 15, at the date of the census of 1881 was, in England, 2,655,625, and in Wales, 144,706; and of boys only in England, 1,316,993, and in Wales, 75,842. The ratio between children attending public elementary schools and all the children of the same age is, according to the education returns for 1887, as 4·5 : 8·5. Therefore, we may calculate that in England there were in 1881 about 1,400,000 children, boys and girls, between the ages of 10 and 15 who were attending or had been attending public elementary schools, and that of these between 600,000 and 700,000 were boys. We thus want scholarships for about 12,000 boys, or 28,000 children (boys and girls together). Now, on investigation of the general *Digest of Charities*, the last number of which was published in 1878, we find that existing educational endowments, the total income of which in England and Wales is £616,882 2s. 8d., or in England alone £636,009 14s., would, if wholly applied for scholarship purposes, provide in the richest county scholarships of £10 for five years for $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. of the boys within it between the ages of 10 and 15, or about 4 per cent. of the past or present public elementary school children (boys) between those ages. In the poorest county the endowments would not provide in that way for more than 1 out of every 600 such children. Thus, on an average, when the funds of all the several counties are thrown into one, about 2 per cent. of boys (if the endowments are supposed to be kept as at present mainly to them), or 1 per cent. of boys and girls together, could be provided for out of endowments alone. If, according to the estimate above given, 1 child in 50 requires secondary education free of cost, the endowments of the country would be very nearly sufficient for the purpose; but this supposes that all the educational endowments, not only of each county, but of the whole country, could be brought together into a common fund. The local feeling is, however, so strong in England, that it may be doubted whether it would be possible to do this to any great extent without raising a tremendous outcry; and there would probably be in most cases strong objections urged to using all the endowments of a school for scholarship purposes, even in connection with that particular school.

Now, there are three sources from which the additional funds required for a complete system of scholarships connecting elementary with higher schools can be derived—grants from a central exchequer, local rates, and private generosity. The great success of the method

How to Systematize Secondary Education. 21

adopted to supplement the City parochial charities funds under Bryce's Act, by a judicious use of the first of these sources to stimulate the flow of the last, suggest that a similar method might be used to promote the object we are now advocating. The Education Department or the Charity Commission, to whichever body the central funds were entrusted, might make grants on some such plan as the following :—

(1) Every inspector of elementary schools to certify each year the number of children in the schools examined by him fit to receive higher education free of cost, and to specify the kind of higher education, classical, mathematical, commercial, or technical, for which they are severally fitted.

(2) Taking the administrative county under the Local Government Act, we must first divide it into districts, for the county itself is too large and the schools in it too far apart for us to take it as our unit. The simplest plan might be to take the electoral division as our unit. Then we should arrange the secondary schools in that division according to their endowment, and assign to each a proportionate number of such elementary school children certified fit for free secondary education. The division in question, we will assume, has secondary schools endowed as follows (the figures are perhaps somewhat Utopian) :—

Name of School.	Income from Annual Endowment.	Percentage.
Blanchester College (classical and mathematical)	£3,000 ...	37·5 or $\frac{3}{8}$
Carlton Technical School	2,400 ...	30·0 or $\frac{1}{3}$
Durnford Grammar School	1,360 ...	17·0 or $\frac{1}{6}$
Durnford Commercial School	850 ...	10·5 or $\frac{2}{10}$
Manby College (for girls)	400 ...	5·0 or $\frac{1}{20}$

If the 200 children were divided equally between the endowed schools, Blanchester should educate 75, Carlton 60, Durnford Grammar School 34, Durnford Commercial School 21, and Manby College 10. But it may be that of the 200 children 100 are certified fit for a classical or mathematical education, 50 for a technical, and 30 for a commercial education, while the remaining 20 are girls. The classical and mathematical schools (Blanchester and Durnford Grammar School) should properly be responsible for 109, but 100 only wish to enter ; the technical school is responsible for 50, and has 50 applicants ; while the commercial school, which should properly be responsible for 21, only has applications for 30 places, and the girls' school, which should take 10, has applications for 20. Some adjustment is needed.

(3) Let grants in aid be made on the following principle :—Let there be paid to every endowed school which educates free its full proportion of children from elementary schools half the regular fees for such children. Where an endowed school provides for part only

of its proportionate number of children, let there be paid to such endowed school half the fees of the children so taught, deducting therefrom half the fees of the remainder, for whom the school fails to provide. If any secondary school, whether endowed or unendowed, public or private, provides for more than its proportionate number of elementary school children, let there be paid to such school two-thirds of the fees of all such children who are over and above its proportionate number—that is, in the case of a secondary school wholly unendowed, two-thirds of the fees of all the elementary school children educated therein free.¹ Such payments would, of course, be made only on the report of an inspector of secondary schools at the end of each year, that so many elementary school children formally certified by the inspector of elementary schools had been taught free in the secondary school during the year, and had passed a satisfactory examination. It would seem necessary to the working of this system that each endowed school in the county should have the choice of educating its full proportion of free children, and that the private schools should step in only on the failure of the endowed schools to do their part.

There might possibly be some competition among the elementary schools of a district, where one or two among the secondary schools which offered free places to certified children were of special eminence. This difficulty could, perhaps, be got over by dividing the places which each secondary school offered among all the competing elementary schools; where there were not enough places at any one secondary school to be divided among all, the best elementary schools (judged by the number of children certified from them by the inspector) would have the first choice of the places there. Within each elementary school the choice of secondary schools would be determined between the certified scholars by order of merit. Secondary schools might also be encouraged to receive children, on the inspector's certificate, at a reduced fee, by having a proportionate part (perhaps one-half) of the amount so remitted allowed, on the report of an inspector of secondary schools, in the calculation of the grant in aid.

The system would be purely voluntary, and need not affect in any way compulsory clauses in school schemes, under which a certain number of scholarships or free places are by law required to be given every year to children from public elementary schools. Many secondary schools, private as well as public, would find it well worth their while to educate a certain number of children for half or two-

¹ *Blanchester College*, for instance, educating 63 children free, would receive half the fees of 51 children only (63 actually taught, instead of 75, the proportionate number, less 12). *Durnford Commercial School*, educating 40 free, would receive half the fees of 21 children, its proportionate number, and two-thirds of the fees of the remaining 19. If a private commercial school educated the surplus 19, or a part of them, instead of *Durnford*, it would be paid two-thirds of the fees of as many as it taught free.

thirds fees, even though they were compelled incidentally to submit to Government inspection.

The result should be that a sum representing rather more than one-half the fees of all such children as required a free secondary education would be paid from public sources other than endowments. Taking the above estimate of £10 for 5 years as the average of full fees, and 28,000 as the number of children, boys and girls, requiring free secondary education, we find that about as much again as the amount of these endowments, say £700,000 a year, is the utmost that would in the far future be needed if every school educated free its full quota of children. Meanwhile, for some time to come, a very much smaller sum would be sufficient; perhaps an addition of £50,000 to the Budget would suffice for the first year, and the amount would gradually increase as one school after another approached its full quota. The system might possibly be varied by the grant in aid being provided from local rather than from imperial sources. In this case, however, the management also must be left to the local authority, the County or District Council, and it would be difficult to avoid allowing to such authority the option of levying or not levying the rate required for the purpose. The uncertainty and inequality which this would cause might perhaps be obviated by making it a question for the ratepayers as a whole, rather than for their representatives on the Council, and the procedure might be assimilated to that provided by the Free Libraries Acts, under which, on a representation from a certain number of inhabitants, a meeting is to be called or a poll to be taken to decide whether or not a rate shall be levied for the purposes of the Acts. The only difference would be that in this case the area would be much larger, being either the county at large, or the district over which the District Council, if it is ever constituted, will preside, and the authority to direct the meeting to be summoned, or the poll to be taken, would be the County or District Council, instead of the Local Board of the district.

2. In the above suggestions, intended to meet the first of the three above-mentioned requirements of secondary education, the solution of the two remaining problems has been to a certain extent anticipated. The present unequal distribution of schools and endowments would be fairly obviated (1) by the inducements offered to private schools to bring themselves within the State system of secondary education by subjecting themselves to Government inspection; (2) by the stimulus given to private benevolence by the grant in aid from the State meeting such benevolence half way; (3) by the opportunity which the State grant would offer to all counties equally of providing free secondary education for all public elementary school children who might need it.

The organization of secondary education might be further pro-

moted by a Government offer to meet private benevolence half way in founding new secondary schools (literary, technical, or commercial) in districts where such schools were certified by the central authority (the Education Department, Charity Commission, or Minister of Education) to be actually needed. The plan adopted by the Charity Commissioners in working the Parochial Charities Act, pound for pound, might be followed here.

Existing schools (public or private) submitting themselves to inspection throughout, and not only as regards their free scholars, might have a further grant in aid. Payment by results is held by many to have worked so badly in the case of elementary schools that some other principle should, if possible, be here adopted. The grant, if made, should be divided into two parts: (1) given on a certificate as to the satisfactory condition of the buildings, sanitary arrangements, &c.; (2) given on a joint report of the inspector and the examiners as to the method of teaching and examination results; the merit of the school would be determined, like the class of a candidate in an Oxford Examination, by a comparison of the A's, B's, and C's assigned by the different examiners, the inspector's vote perhaps counting for two.

3. As regards inspection we have already said a good deal. The inspector must, we think, be an officer sent from a central department. Otherwise there will be a lack of system and a difference of standard. Moreover, the area for which the inspector of secondary schools will be appointed will, in most cases, be much wider than that of any local authority. His functions will be to inspect the buildings, to supervise the methods of teaching, and to report from time to time upon the condition of the schools under his care. He will not necessarily be an examiner, though he should have the power of examining the school at least once in the year. But as there is always a danger in relying on the report of one examiner, especially if he continues unchanged from year to year, it will be well that the grant should not depend wholly upon the inspector's examination. A further examination by external examiners should be made a necessary condition of the grant, and for this purpose existing examining bodies, the Oxford and Cambridge Schools Examination Board, the Delegates of Oxford and Cambridge Local Examinations, and the College of Preceptors should be recognized for different classes in each school, or for different kinds of schools.

The same inspector will clearly not be fitted to inspect secondary schools of all the different types, classical, technical, and commercial. It will be necessary that there shall be in each area an inspector of classical and mathematical schools, an inspector of technical, and an inspector of modern or commercial schools. Where mathematics or modern subjects are taught in a classical school, it will generally be enough if a separate external examiner in those subjects is required.

The area of an inspectorship must at first be made rather extensive, wider probably than the administrative county. But as endowed schools increase in number, and private schools begin to put themselves under the *régime*, the inspector's duties will increase also, and it may in time be necessary to have a separate inspector for each district. The technical and commercial inspectors will at first be appointed to much wider areas than the classical inspectors.

The importance of attaching the inspectorate to a central department is clearly seen, when we touch on their third main duty, that of reporting upon the condition of schools in their several districts. It is very necessary that these reports be made public, that they should be analyzed and compared, and general reports issued from time to time, based upon the district reports, to show the condition of secondary education throughout the country. These reports should be published in as cheap and compendious a form as possible. One cannot but be struck by the difficulty which exists at present in obtaining any general information in regard to secondary schools in England and Wales. On all such questions as the number of scholars in secondary and even in public secondary schools throughout the country, or the comparative number of classical, mathematical, technical, or commercial scholars, there is no information available at all. The only information we have as to endowments is to be sought for painfully in the columns of the last *Digest of Charities*, now more than ten years old, and published in isolated numbers extending over a series of years.

Full information on these and many other points is needed, and could only be supplied by the joint action of inspectors and a central department with which they were closely in touch.

The vexed question of the registration of teachers may be referred to here, as the publication of reports in which notice was taken by authority of the qualifications or want of qualification of teachers would, we think, in time solve the difficulty. Teaching power so often exists in masters who are too old or too busy to submit themselves for examination; that it would seem scarcely advisable to make compulsory any registration depending on examination. The only other title of registration would be teaching power, but of this the best proof is actual success, and we see no use in requiring the inspector to take on him the invidious task of giving or denying expressly to this or that teacher a certificate of fitness, when his report for all who chose to read it would do implicitly the same thing.

With these few reforms, interfering as little as possible with the independence of existing schools, and leaving room for the freest expansion in the future to meet the ever new wants of a growing population, we should have secured at a small cost a fairly complete organization of secondary education, which would compare not unfavourably with the more rigid and compulsory systems of France and Germany.

MOTLEY'S CORRESPONDENCE.¹

AMONG the great writers of the present century there is no one whose name ought to be dearer to lovers of freedom on both sides of the Atlantic than that of John Lothrop Motley. It is impossible to find anywhere an historian inspired with a higher moral purpose, and there are few, indeed, whose perceptions of right and wrong have been so keen and so uniformly sound. His love of justice and liberty was an even stronger passion with him (and that it saying much) than was the admiration of Carlyle and his disciple, Mr. Froude, for tyranny and brute force. Mr. Motley, in his judgments, is no respecter of persons. Even in the present day there is a tendency to visit the sins of kings and emperors with less censure than those of ordinary persons. But Mr. Motley evinces no such tendency. He is almost the only historian who has spoken with due reprobation of the character of Charles V., a sovereign who still finds admirers, although a far less amount of treachery and cruelty than he displayed would be considered amply sufficient to brand the perpetrator of them as a monster of villany.

All the numerous readers of Mr. Motley's works will have been anxious for some record of his personal life, and though the want was partially supplied by the interesting memoir written by his friend, Dr. Holmes, some years ago, yet many will have felt that that biography was somewhat too brief, and will gladly welcome, as a needed supplement to it, the two volumes of correspondence before us.

The earliest letters which have been preserved date from the childhood of the future historian; but the first which we find of much interest refer to the period of his student life in Germany, which he entered upon in 1832, at the age of eighteen. In a letter to his mother he thus describes the duels which are a well-known feature of German universities: "These things are such a common and every-day occurrence that I have ceased to think at all about them. I must, in the first place, tell you that the accounts you have read of the frequency of these things are not in the slightest degree exaggerated; in fact, it is entirely impossible to exaggerate them. I have been here now almost three weeks, and during that time as

¹ *The Correspondence of John Lothrop Motley.* Edited by George William Curtis. Two vols. 8vo. London: John Murray.

many as forty have been fought, to my knowledge, and I know of as many as 150 more that are to take place directly. I have seen a few of them, and, though you have read accounts of them, I suppose you will be willing to hear a short description. The duels are not allowed to be fought in the town, and accordingly an inn called the 'Kaiser,' just outside one of the gates, is a very celebrated rendezvous. They generally take place between members of different *Lands-mannschaften* (the word means countrymen-club or society); there are as many of these as there are sets of students from the different States of Germany. . . . The arms, defensive and offensive, required in the duel are provided for the duellists by their respective societies. These arms are a sabre, about four feet in length, blunt at the point, but very sharp-edged, and a suit of stuffed leather to protect all the vital parts, leaving only the face and breast exposed. The last time I was at the 'Kaiser' about sixteen duels were fought during the day; ten of these I saw, and they are on the whole stupid affairs, and, I think, could exist nowhere but in Germany. It is not, however, a perfect trifle to fight one of these duels, though it is very seldom that any lives are lost or even important wounds received. But the face is often barbarously mangled; and, indeed it is almost impossible to meet a student who has not at least one or two large scars on his visage. In the two duels I saw the other day, one man was cut, not very severely, on the breast, and the other received a wound that laid his face open from the left eye to the mouth, and will probably enhance the beauty of his countenance for the rest of his life. You need be under no apprehension about my returning home with a disfigured visage, for as a foreigner is seldom or never insulted, and if he be, has the right of choosing his own weapons (which in my case would be pistols or rifles, and the Germans have an aversion to gunpowder), the offender generally makes an apology and backs out of the business."

After a stay of three years in Europe, Mr. Motley returned to his native country in 1835. He crossed the Atlantic for the second time in 1841, on the occasion of his appointment as secretary to the American Embassy to Russia. Ocean steam navigation was then in its infancy, and the following catalogue of his discomforts will have a strange sound in the ears of modern voyagers. "Everything is dirty, disorderly, and disgusting. There is no room in the state-rooms to put so much as a tooth-pick, not a drawer nor a shelf, but everything is left to knock about on the floor at its own sweet will. There is no cabin to sit in, the narrow piggery in which we are fed being entirely filled up with the troughs and benches. There is no deck to walk on, as the whole, or nearly the whole, of the space is occupied by the upper cabin, the state-rooms being below. As for the ladies' cabin, I have not been in it; but I am told they are much worse off than the gentlemen."

Of the ceremony of presentation at the Russian court we have a graphic description. "We were drawn up in solemn column by the master of the ceremonies, and formed a very respectable semi-circle, beginning with the dowager of St. Petersburg (as he calls himself), Lord Stuart de Rothesay, at one end, and tapering off with those who have not yet been presented. By this arrangement I was, of course, very near the foot of the class, and stood between a Danish *attaché* and Sir Robert Porter, British *Chargé d'Affaires* at Venezuela. Presently a file of ladies marched in and stationed themselves along by the windows of the hall opposite the diplomatic circle. Among these were the Grand Duchess Helena, the Grand Duchess Olga, and various others whose faces I was too blind to distinguish, and who were too great to be aimed at with an eyeglass, and immediately afterwards came their Majesties—male and female. They attacked the Ministers first, beginning with the English ambassador, and so on along the line of diplomats stationed according to their office, rank, and seniority of commission. His Majesty, on reaching our end, despatched his victim with a bow or a single question, passing on to the next man as soon as each name was fairly announced. My introduction consisted in the announcement of my name and office, and an exchange of bows. The Empress stopped a moment after I had kissed her hand in my turn, and the following instructive and amusing conversation took place. 'Did you arrive with the Minister?' 'No, your Majesty.' 'How did you come?' 'By the Berlin route.' 'Ah, did you stop some time in Berlin?' and with this she tottered off to the next man. After she had reached the bottom of the class, and heard us all say our lessons, she passed with the Emperor into the next hall, and the school broke up, or rather we had a recess. The old stagers were dismissed, but the youngsters who had not yet gone the rounds were requested to stop to be presented to the Grand Duke Héritier and his spouse. We waited accordingly, and, after a little while, we were served up to the Grand Duke, a fresh-looking young man, who, like his august father, swallowed half a dozen of us at a mouthful, myself included, only bowing as we were successively introduced, and asking questions of but one or two. After this ceremony we marched off and went home."

Mr. Motley returned to America in 1842, and he soon conceived the idea of the great work of his life, the history of the Dutch Commonwealth. After he had begun to collect materials for the purpose, he found that it would be necessary for him to consult frequently the records stored up in European libraries. Accordingly, he crossed the ocean for the third time in 1851, accompanied by his family.

He thus describes the impression produced upon him by his labours in the archives of Brussels. "The dead men of the place are my intimate friends. With the fellows of the sixteenth century I am on the most familiar terms. Any ghost that ever flits by night across

the moonlight square is at once hailed by me as a man and a brother. I call him by his Christian name at once. . . . Whatever may be the result of my labours no one can say that I have not worked hard like a brute beast, but I do not care for the result. The labour is in itself its own reward and all I want. I go day after day to the archives here, studying the old letters and documents of the sixteenth century. Here I remain among my fellow worms, feeding on those musty mulberry leaves of which we are afterwards to spin our silk. How can you expect anything interesting from such a cocoon? It is, however, not without its amusement, in a mouldy sort of way, this reading of dead letters. It is something to read the real *bond-fide* signs-manual of such fellows as William of Orange, Count Egmont, Alexander Farnese, Philip the Second, Cardinal Granvelle, and the rest of them. It gives a 'realizing sense,' as the Americans have it." In 1854 he visited England in search of a publisher for the *Rise of the Dutch Republic*. As is well known, he was unfortunate in his first application and met with a refusal, which was afterwards greatly regretted by its author. His anticipations were of a rather despondent nature. "I shall be surprised," he writes, "if a hundred copies were sold at the end of a year." In fact, as many as 17,000 were sold in England during the year after its publication. Nearly all the best judges recognized at once that a valuable addition had been made to the ranks of historical literature, though there were a few exceptions. The *Saturday Review*, as Motley writes, was "decidedly disagreeable," and, even in the present year, it has made a kind of attempt to vindicate its former judgment by depreciating the merits of the historian of the Netherlands.

However, it may with confidence be affirmed that few, if any, similar works of the present century will outlive the *Dutch Republic*. The general accuracy of its facts no serious attempt has been made to impeach, and for thrilling pieces of historical narration hardly anything can be found to equal Motley's descriptions. Who can forget the feelings with which they perused for the first time the story of the siege and relief of Leyden, a narrative which will stand a favourable comparison even with Macaulay's account of Londonderry? And what writer can be named who is animated with a more burning love of truth and right? The words of the author's friend, Mr. Theodore Fay, coloured as they may be by personal affection, are substantially true: "It is a noble painting grandly done, the delineations of character not only by a master hand but from a heart that sees right through the souls of men and means to speak the truth. I do not know that there could be found a period of grander interest or an historian more able to represent it with all the force of truth. The drama is opened and conducted with superior power. The figures rise upon the mind in fearfully vivid colours but without exaggeration. There is a rare union of simplicity and

strength of poetry. The style is limpid, forcible, unaffected, and eloquent. The author has received from Nature a high historic power, and the marks of conscientious study and reflection are felt in all the details."

As soon as the first portion of his labours had seen the light, the historian began to collect materials for the sequel of his work: *History of the United Netherlands from the Death of William the Silent*. He thus amusingly describes some of the difficulties he encountered when anxious to consult certain records in England: "I am almost distraught at the circumlocution and circumvolution of London. 'To try to do anything here in a hurry is to 'hew down oaks with rushes.' Sisyphus with his rock was an idle loafing individual compared to the martyr who is doomed to work up the precipice of English routine. I have been in London a month, and my rock has just come down upon my toes for the fourth or fifth time. I have not yet got into the State Paper Office, where I expected to have effected my entrance after the first day or two succeeding my arrival. I thought to have done a great deal of work there by this time. But the American Minister and the Minister for Foreign Affairs, and the Minister of the Interior, and the Master of the Rolls (who, by-the-way, is not a baker as Lowell would probably suggest), and various other dignitaries have all to be made aware (in a Pickwickian sense) that an insignificant individual like myself is desirous of reading some musty and forgotten old letters, which not one of them could read or would wish to if they could. A friend of mine once went into a soda-water shop in Boston on a very hot day, and was told by an elderly individual behind the counter that his son John, the proprietor of the establishment, had gone to Portland, but that upon his return he would undoubtedly be very happy to prepare him a glass. This is exactly my case. The Earl of Clarendon is absent with the Queen at Balmoral, Panizzi, of the British Museum, is at Turin. Dallas is at the Isle of Wight, and others are hiding themselves in other corners, or pretending to be absent, even if actually here, because in September it is disreputable to be in London. No moral or religious person, therefore, would acknowledge himself to be here. When these illustrious personages all get back, they will unite to prepare my glass of soda-water."

His letters during the period of this visit to England are exceedingly interesting, as he was thrown into intercourse with most of the leading political, literary, and other celebrities of the day. His sketches of them are full of life, and are always most genial and good-humoured; in fact, it might be objected to the fidelity of his descriptions that he paints every one too much *colour de rose*. This, however, is a fault on the right side, and contrasts very agreeably with the unrestrained bitterness with which Carlyle, in his

Reminiscences, speaks of nearly all with whom he came in contact. The two historians were evidently as unlike each other in personal character as they were opposed in principle, and it is pleasant to find that the champion of freedom showed himself so superior in his private life to the advocate of despotism.

One of the most entertaining passages in the correspondence thus describes an encounter between two octogenarian^{ex}-Lord Chancellors. "At the other end of the table, on each side, were Brougham and Lyndhurst. Lyndhurst appears younger than Brougham, although really six years older (he was eighty-six last week). Every now and then we, at our end, paused to listen to them chaffing each other across the table. Lyndhurst said, 'Brougham, you disgraced the woolsack by appearing there with these plaid trousers, and with your peer's robe on one occasion, put on your chancellor's gown.' 'The deuce,' said Brougham, 'you know that to be a calumny; I never wore the plaid trousers.' 'Well,' said Lyndhurst, 'he confesses to two gowns. Now, the present Lord Chancellor never appears except in small clothes and silk stockings!' Upon which Lady Stanley observed that the ladies in the gallery all admired Lord Chelmsford for his handsome leg. 'A virtue that was never seen in you, Brougham,' said Lyndhurst, and so on."

Mr. Motley was evidently greatly attracted by Lord Lyndhurst, and says that he "liked him very much," not remembering, apparently, that this agreeable old gentleman had in his day had his share in the doings of the most tyrannical Government with which England has been afflicted since Stuart times. Among other distinguished men whom he met in London was his fellow-historian, Macaulay, then utterly broken down in health, it being the year before his death. Motley thus writes of him: "It is always delightful to meet Macaulay, and to see the reverence with which he is regarded by everybody; painful to observe the friendly anxiety which everybody feels about his health. He was obliged to leave the table for a few minutes on account of a spasm of coughing, which has been the case ever since I have met him. I think, unless he is much changed, that Sydney Smith's descriptions, or rather flings at him, are somewhat unjust. He is not in the least the colloquial oppressor he has been represented. On the contrary, every one wishes to hear him talk, and very often people are disappointed because they do not hear him talk enough. To be sure, a mind so brimful as his must spout forth uncontrollably, if you once pull out the plug; nevertheless, he is always willing to shut himself up again, if anybody else wishes to pour himself out. Usually nobody does when he is present. His conversation is, however, rather learned and didactic than *spirituelle*. His brilliant flashes are only those of silence, according to Sydney's memorable sarcasm. This is strange, for in his writings he is brilliant and flashing almost to painfulness, but I

observe nothing pointed, epigrammatic, or humorous in his talk. It is very wise and very instructive, but not the kind to set the table in a roar."

During all this period of his residence in Europe Mr. Motley's interest in the politics of Europe was very keen and, as might be expected, he witnessed with the most hearty sympathy the successful struggle for Italian freedom in 1859-60, which must have reminded him in many respects of the subject of his own history. Italy in the nineteenth century, like Holland in the sixteenth, exhibiting the spectacle of a people delivering itself from foreign tyranny and asserting its place among the nations of the world. He, with good reason, distrusted from the first the lofty professions of the French Emperor of his devotion to the Italian cause. "The confidence reposed by the whole Italian people at the beginning of this year in the intentions of Louis Napoleon, was as incredible as it was pathetic, and would have converted into a hero any man standing in his position who had been possessed of one spark of virtue or generosity. There is no doubt of two things—that he originated the Italian revolt, and that he has, against the unanimous wishes of the Italians, left them in the lurch, having pledged himself to Austria to restore the archdukes. The firm, moderate, consistent, unanimous, dignified, and courageous conduct of the Italians in this tremendous crisis will always remain one of the grand lessons of history. If they are destined to be crushed into submission, after this calm and deliberate expression of their wishes, at any rate a significant chapter in the history of freedom and tyranny will have been recorded, and it will be something that the mask will at last be torn from the face of the French Emperor."

In 1860 the first two volumes of the *United Netherlands* appeared. This work has generally been considered somewhat inferior to the one to which it forms a sequel, and the author was sensible that the difficulties of his subject were greater than in the former case. "My task," he says, "is a very large and hard one. My canvas is very broad, and the composition of the picture will give me more trouble than the more compact one which I have already painted. Then I have not got a grand central heroic figure, like William the Silent, to give unity, and flesh, and blood, interest to the scene. The history will, I fear, be duller and less dramatic than the other."

It must be admitted that the period in which the author was now engaged does not, on the whole, present so many scenes of thrilling interest as that of his previous subject, and it may also be conceded that his powers were not at their greatest when he had to deal with the wearisome and complicated diplomatic negotiations which occupy so large a portion of the history between 1584 and 1588. He had not that wonderful art by which Macaulay contrives to make even such details plain and interesting. When all this is said, however,

there is little to detract from the solid merits of the work. For a detailed piece of narrative, the account of the siege of Antwerp is not unworthy even to be set beside the tales of Leyden; and if, in the one case, the reader's sympathies were kindled by the success of a noble struggle under the extremities of suffering against odds, apparently hopeless; in the other, equally powerful feelings of indignation will be excited against the selfishness and stupidity which threw away the most favourable opportunities and yielded the victory, not to the superior force, but to the superior genius in the service of the cause of tyranny. Again, the vigour with which the duplicity and meanness which too frequently marked the policy of Queen Elizabeth are set forth, and the ruthless shattering of a popular idol who had too long occupied a pedestal greatly beyond her deserts are worthy of all commendation. Her admirers have never been able to answer the case thus presented against her, and have made but feeble attempts to do so.

Hardly had these volumes been published when the author's attention was for a time called away from the troubles of the Dutch to those of his own Commonwealth. The great American civil war had begun, and Motley watched its opening with feelings of the most intense interest. While he sorrowed at the prospect of a fearful and bloody strife, he always looked forth with hope to the ultimate issue. He never doubted but that the end would be the destruction of that accursed slave-power which had too long domineered over his country, and rendered its professions of being the freest government on earth a bitter mockery. He was naturally greatly disappointed at the sympathy so largely displayed in England for the wrong cause. "This, then, is the value," he writes, soon after his return to America in 1861, "men say to me every moment, of the anti-slavery sentiment of England, of which she has boasted so much to mankind. This is the end of all the taunts and reproaches which she has flung at the United States Government for being perpetually controlled by the slavery-power, and for allowing its policy to be constantly directed towards extending that institution. Now that we have overthrown that party, and now that we are struggling to maintain our national existence, and, with it, liberty, law, and amalgamation, against the insurrection which that overthrow has excited, we are treated to the cold shoulder of the mother country, quite as decidedly as if she had never had an opinion or a sentiment on the subject of slavery, and as if the greatest war of principle which has been waged in this generation at least was of no more interest to her, except as it bore on the cotton question, than the wretched quarrels of Mexico or South America. Men say to me, we did not wish England to lift a little finger to help us, but we have looked in vain for any noble words of encouragement or sympathy. We thought that some voice might have been heard to say, We are sorry for you, you are passing

through a terrible ordeal, but we feel that you are risking your fortune and your lives for a noble cause, that the conflict has been forced upon you, that you could not recede without becoming a byword of scorn among the nations ; our hands are tied, we must be neutral in action, you must fight the fight yourselves, you would be ashamed to accept assistance ; but our hearts are with you, and God defend the right. But of all this there is not a word." The reproach was but too just at the time, though afterwards the " masses " of England showed unmistakably that their hearts were on the right side, and proved, as on so many other occasions, that they were wiser than the " classes."¹

It seems extraordinary, but the fact is certain that a portion of the English press which had incessantly been flinging the reproach of slavery in the teeth of the United States was found, when the war broke out, on the side of the slave-owners. If any one desires a proof of this let him consult the columns of that venerable organ of fossil Toryism, *Blackwood's Magazine*, and compare the articles on American affairs for the years 1857 and 1861 respectively. The contrasts will be found both amusing and instructive, and fully bears out Mr. Motley's complaint which has been cited above.

Further, as showing the confused ideas which many Englishmen had of American affairs, there is no doubt but that large numbers of persons in this country were irritated by the abusive tone which had for a long time previous to the war been adopted towards England by a portion of the American press, and that this feeling led them to sympathize with the rebellion. And certainly very gross provocation had been given in this way which furnished a reasonable cause of complaint. Only a little more knowledge would have shown that the offensive language proceeded almost entirely from the party of the Southern slave-owners and their Northern sympathizers who had controlled the Union for a long time previous to 1860, and that it was most unfair to lay the blame of it on the party which then came into power, and which on the contrary included nearly all those who had been most friendly to England. As Motley truly says, the Free States had been " the most England loving part of the country," and hence their people were naturally " full of sorrow at the attitude taken up by England." Like most of his countrymen, he entertained too sanguine expectations of a speedy close to the war, and was bitterly disappointed by the news of the disaster of Bull Run. " We are for the moment overwhelmed in gloom," he writes. " The period has arrived for us, as it has often arrived for other commonwealths in history, when we must fight for national existence, or agree to be extinguished peaceably. I am not very

¹ Among the honourable exceptions to the general tone of the English press, we may be permitted to remark that, all through the war, the WESTMINSTER REVIEW advocated the cause of the North.

desponding, although the present is gloomy. Perhaps the day will come ere long when we shall all of us, not absolutely incapacitated by age or sickness, be obliged to shoulder our rifles as privates in the ranks. As I am not fit to be an officer, being utterly without military talent or training, and as it is now decided that such responsible offices shall not be conferred except upon those who can bear an examination by competent military authorities, I am obliged to regret my want of early education in the only pursuit which is now useful. As to going abroad and immersing myself again in the sixteenth century, it is simply an impossibility. I can think of nothing but American affairs, and should be almost ashamed if it were otherwise." However, his destiny was to summon him to Europe again soon, for in August 1861 he was appointed by President Lincoln ambassador to Austria, and he at once accepted the post, feeling that in that way he could best serve his country. There was no relaxation, however, in the intense interest with which he continued to watch the events of the war. Hardly had he entered upon the duties of his new position when there seemed to be imminent danger of England being embroiled with the United States over the *Trent* affair. The prospect of such a calamity filled the new ambassador with consternation and horror. "I simply feel," he said, "that if a war is to take place between England and America, I shall be in danger of losing my reason." The many close ties of friendship he had contracted in England lent an additional pang of bitterness to the pain which he, like every true-hearted man on both sides of the ocean, felt at the thought of such a fratricidal strife, while his good sense told him that if England were engaged in the war the triumph of the South, for a time at least, was certain. "To receive at this distance those awful telegrams day by day announcing in briefest terms, bombardment of Boston, destruction of the Federal fleet, occupation of Washington and New York by the Confederates and their English allies, and all these thousand such horrors, while I am forced to sit so far away, will be too much to bear. It is mere brag and fustian to talk about fighting England and the South at once."

Great indeed was his relief when the welcome news arrived of the peaceful settlement of the dispute. He was still, however, anxious that the justice of the cause of the North should be more fully recognized in England, and he felt that, for this object, it was above all things needful that slavery should be made manifest as the real cause of the war. "One thing is perfectly certain, that if we continue to dally with the subject of emancipation much longer, and continue our efforts to repress the rebellion without daring to lay a finger on its cause, we shall have the slave confederacy recognized by all the governments of Europe before midsummer. The pro-slavery party in England dare not avow itself in favour of slavery, for that insti-

tution is so odious to the great mass of the English nation as to consign any party openly supporting it to destruction ; but it contents itself with persuading the public that slavery has nothing to do with secession, that the North is no more anti-slavery than the South, and that therefore all the sympathies of liberal Englishmen ought to be given to the weaker of the two nations which is striving by a war of self-defence to relieve itself from a tyrannical oppression." He was naturally delighted when his wishes were realized by the appearance of President Lincoln's emancipation proclamation. "The proclamation," he writes, "was just in time ; had it been delayed it is possible that England would have accepted the invitation of France, which was in reality to recognize the slaveholders' confederacy to make with it an alliance offensive and defensive. The object is distinctly to unite all Europe against us, to impose peace, and forcibly to dismember our country. Nothing has saved us from this disaster, thus far, except the anti-slavery feeling in England, which throughout the country, though not in high places, is the predominant popular instinct which no statesman dares confront." He had by this time resumed his historical labours, but his attention was continually diverted to the events of his own day. "I try to write, but it is hard with one's thoughts so perpetually absorbed with our own thoughts against tyrants more bloody than Philip or Alva, and an institution more accursed than the Spanish Inquisition. The ever-living present is so much more entraining with its horrors than the past, which, thank God, is dead and buried with its iniquities." The confused feelings with which the ruling classes in England and Europe generally regarded the American struggle are well set forth in the following passage : "Here is the puzzle for the European mind. Whoever heard before in human history of a rebellion except one made by the people against privilege ? That the people rising from time to time, after years of intolerable oppression, against their natural masters, kings, nobles, priests, and the like, should be knocked back into their appropriate servitude by the strong hand of authority at any expense of treasure and blood, why this is all correct. But when the privileged order of the New World, the 300,000 slaveholders leading on their 3,000,000 dupes, rise in revolt against the natural and legal and constitutional authority of the sovereign people, and when that authority, after pushing conciliation and concession in the face of armed treason to the verge of cowardice, at last draw the sword and defend the national existence against the rebels, why then it is bloodshed, causeless civil war, and so on."

Few will now refuse to admit the correctness of Motley's view of the matter ; many in England, indeed, whose sympathies were entirely with the South now praise the Americans for having maintained their union without attending to English opinion, and go on to draw the inference that England should keep up the present legis-

lative union with Ireland without regarding American opinion. The sophistry of this argument is manifest enough. It is perfectly plain that the word "union" is used in totally different senses in the two cases. There is not much resemblance between the free and equal confederation devised by the patriotic statesmanship of Washington and Hamilton, and the infamous bargain which Castlereagh and his tools imposed on unhappy Ireland, by the vilest corruption and the most unscrupulous coercion. And few in all probability of these so-called "Unionists" who attempt to draw a moral in their favour from the American struggle, are aware that every one of the United States enjoys far larger powers of self-government than Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule Bill proposed to confer on Ireland. The South, in fact, while enjoying perfect internal freedom, sought to break up the commonwealth because it was no longer able as it had been to dictate to the North. The proper parallel to such conduct would be the revolt threatened by some of the Orange party in Ulster, in the event of Home Rule becoming law, which, like the slave-owners' rebellion, would be an insurrection of a privileged class against popular authority, and, like it, would no doubt meet with sympathy from the "classes" in England. Indeed, many of the loudest sticklers for "law and order" have not been ashamed to express approval of the blusterings of the Orangemen, which, however, it is very doubtful whether these valorous heroes seriously intend to carry out in action.

After the war had lasted two years, Motley had come to perceive that an early termination was not to be expected, and, confident of ultimate victory, he devoted himself with more composure to his historical labours. He thus expresses himself: "As I have now made up my mind that our war is to be protracted indefinitely, I am trying to withdraw my attention from it, and to plunge into the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries again. While I am occupying myself with the events of a civil war which lasted eighty years, and engaged and exhausted the energies of all the leading Powers of Europe, perhaps I may grow less impatient with military operations extended over a much larger and less populated area, and which have not yet continued for two years." It will not, however, surprise any reader of this correspondence to find that the historian was never able to forget the events of his own time, and soon after he wrote the words above quoted his enthusiasm was kindled to the highest pitch by the successes of the North at Vicksburg and Gettysburg, which, as many expected then and all recognize now, proved to be the turning-point of the war. He thus describes his exultation at the news: "There was no one in the house to join me in my hurrah but my youngest infant. And my conduct very much resembled that of the excellent Philip II. when he heard of the fall of Antwerp, for I went to Susie's door screeching through the key-hole, 'Vicksburg is ours!' Just as that other *père de famille*, more potent, but I trust

not more respectable than I, conveyed the news to his Infanta [*vide* for the incident an American work on the Netherlands and the authorities there cited]. I have never faltered in my faith, and in the darkest hours when misfortunes seemed thronging most thickly upon us, I have never felt the want of anything to lean against; but I own I did feel like shaking hands with a few hundred people when I heard of our 4th July, 1863, work, and I should like to have heard and joined in an American cheer or two." The tidings that reached him of the great uprising of the English masses in favour of the Northern cause gave him great delight. He says: "Meetings are held day by day all over England, in which the strongest sympathy is expressed for the United States Government, and detestation for the slave-holders and their cause, by people belonging to the working and humbler classes, who, however, make up the mass of the nation, and whose sentiments no English Ministry (Whig or Tory) dares to oppose."

There has never in fact been a case which better illustrated the truth of the proposition often ridiculed as an absurd paradox that the popular judgment in politics is, as a rule, more just than that of the higher orders. Hardly any one now denies that the cause of the South was a thoroughly bad one, and that its overthrow was a great blessing to the world; yet a large majority of the educated classes in England at the time wished and believed that the slave-holders would succeed. So it was again in the struggle against Jingoism; so it is now in the Home Rule controversy. Liberals may feel perfectly easy in their minds when they are told that Mr. Gladstone's policy is condemned by all whose opinion is worth having. They may rest assured that twenty years hence, when Ireland enjoys peace and prosperity under a native Legislature, these superior persons will accept the result as complacently as they now do the triumph of the North, though they would have hindered both events if they could.

We have not space in which to quote more than a small portion of Motley's correspondence during the war; but what must strike every reader as pervading both his own letters and those of his correspondents in America, is the intense spirit of patriotic devotion and confidence in the nobleness of their cause by which all the writers are animated. And in truth few nations have ever shown so great an amount of heroism and self-devotion, accompanied by as comparatively few follies and blunders, as the people of the Free States showed in this great contest. That some follies and blunders would be committed was inevitable; but we look in vain for the great crimes which in similar struggles have been too often perpetrated in abundance even by those who, on the whole, had right on their side. Was there ever a case in history before of a rebellion being terminated without a single life being taken except on the

battle-field? When we consider the wholesale executions which attended the suppression of the revolts in the Highlands in 1746 and in Ireland in 1798, of which the last had certainly far more provocation to plead in its defence than even the most extreme partisan of the South could possibly allege, we must admit that the American democracy in the present century did indeed prove themselves immeasurably more free from that most hateful of all vices, cruelty, than the English aristocracy in the last.

Motley's feelings at the close of the war were naturally those of intense rejoicing and relief, tempered, however, by deep sorrow for the tragic fate of President Lincoln. He thus writes on hearing the terrible news: "I cannot trust myself yet to speak of President Lincoln, for I am afraid of possible exaggeration. I had a great reverence for his character: a sentiment which had been steadily growing for the last two years. On the very first interview that I had with him in the summer of 1861, he impressed me as a man of the most extraordinary conscientiousness. He seemed to have a window in his breast. There was something almost childlike in that absence of guile and affectation of any kind. Of course, on the few occasions when I had the privilege of conversing with him, it was impossible for me to pretend to form an estimate as to his intellectual power, but I was struck with his simple wisdom, his straightforward unsophisticated common sense. What our Republic, what the whole world, has to be grateful for is that God has endowed our chief magistrate at such a momentous period of history with so lofty a moral nature and with so loving and forgiving a disposition. His mental abilities were large and they became the more robust as the more weight was imposed upon them, and his faculty of divining the right amid the conflict of dogmas, theories, and of weighing other men's opinions while retaining his own judgment, almost amounted to political genius, but his great characteristic was devotion to duty."

Few will now question the substantial correctness of this estimate of Lincoln's character, and yet, if our judgment of him had been formed from a perusal of many of the English newspapers during the war, we should regard the great President as either a drivelling idiot or a brutal tyrant: perhaps a revolting combination of the two. Surely this ought to make us cautious how far we accept the opinions of the English press as to the character of American public men at the present day. It is not likely that the United States have now any statesman of the calibre of Abraham Lincoln, and, indeed, they hardly need him at the present moment; but still the remembrance of the gross blunder our omniscient instructors then fell into, should cause some hesitation before we believe, as some of them would tell us, that American politicians are all fools or knaves.

Mr. Motley's official reports to his Government during 1866 were,

as he says in one of his letters, of course full of the Austria-Prussian war, but he does not seem to have taken very much interest in the contest itself. His allusions to it are in a kind of bantering strain which he half apologizes for, and he evidently felt the great contrast between this strife of conflicting selfish interest and personal pretensions and the lofty patriotic enthusiasm by which he and his countrymen had lately been animated. There was not now so much to distract him from his historical pursuits, and in May 1866 he completed his *United Netherlands*. "I wrote," he says, "finis to volume fourth and last the day before yesterday, at half-past five, while the croquet people were bowling on the lawn through the open window." Under these not very dignified surroundings was written that noble passage which none who have read it can ever forget, in which the author, after taking an affectionate farewell of the readers who had accompanied him so far, assures them that "if by his labours a generous love has been fostered for that blessing without which everything that this earth can offer is worthless, freedom of thought, speech, and life, his highest wish has been fulfilled." Golden words, indeed! which express the very spirit of the historian's life and work, and worthy of being taken by every Liberal writer and speaker as the key-note of all his endeavours.

After his recall from the Vienna embassy in 1867, Motley again visited England, and renewed many old ties of friendship and acquaintance. He thus describes a gathering of great men where there was more food for the mind than for the body:—"I went to-day to lunch with the Grotes; Stuart Mill and his wife were there. . . . Poor Mrs. Grote, who had but just arrived from Wiesbaden, where she had been seeking for health in the waters and finding none, I fear, had been in much pain all the forenoon, and funnily enough she had forgotten to tell the servants that she had company to luncheon. Luckily, I had already told her that I almost never lunched. Mill and Grote could feast themselves and others on pure reason, so that the scraps of cold meat with an incidental potato sufficed for the somewhat Barmecidal meal. Mrs. Grote's reminiscences and the talk at table, as you may suppose, with such company, were most delightful and instructive. But, alas! I have taken no notes, so that I can give you no politico-economical, philosophical, or platonic apothegms fresh from the lips of Grote and Mill."

After a visit of a few months to his native country, the historian again returned to England in 1869 as American Minister to London. The painful circumstances attending his recall in 1870 are well known from Dr. Holmes' memoir, and public opinion on both sides of the ocean has been almost unanimous in condemning the conduct of President Grant on that occasion. The editor has, perhaps,

wisely decided not to publish any private correspondence specially bearing on the subject, but Mr. Motley's strong and justifiable feeling of resentment is expressed by several incidental allusions in his letters which have been suffered to remain. Of more interest at the present moment are his opinions on English politics, and the following passage on Mr. Gladstone's Irish policy is even truer now than in 1870: "After all, the success of government as the world progresses is more and more seen to depend upon its conformity to the great elemental laws, to the simplest moral precepts. In short, justice, truth; and faith are immutable; and the ship steered by that compass rarely gets among the breakers. I imagine that had Ireland been always dealt with, since the days of the Plantagenets, in accordance with those principles, there would have been no Irish question at this moment striking down to the foundations of the Empire. Your great Minister has applied the heroic remedy with entire success to one abomination. An alien State Church over a conquered country is now numbered with the dead iniquities, and the wonder is that it should have been left to the latter part of the nineteenth century to extirpate this wrong. And still the Nemesis remains but half appeased, and calls for other sacrifices, before the confiscations, and persecutions, and violation of the holiest rights which stretch through centuries, and of which that Church was only one of the later instruments, shall be atoned for. Nemesis is a goddess who will not be cheated out of her sacrifices. We have found this out on our side of the water, Heaven knows! and I pray and believe that your sacrifices may be neither as costly in blood or in treasure as ours have been to atone for the slavery iniquity." It is not difficult to imagine the feelings with which Motley would have regarded the policy of Mr. Balfour and the pain with which he would have seen it supported by some of his old English friends who then seemed as great lovers of freedom as Mr. Gladstone or himself.

After his diplomatic career had finally terminated, Motley applied himself once more to his old field of labour, and, in 1873, he published his *Life of John of Burnereld*, thus carrying on the history of the Netherlands to the commencement of the Thirty Years' War. It was his intention to go on to tell the story of that great conflict, which, unfortunately, yet remains to be told in the English language, but his health had now rapidly begun to break down. His letters during the last portion of his life lack the buoyant cheerfulness of his earlier ones, and especially after the death of his wife, in 1874, exhibit often a growing sense of bodily weakness and a considerable depression of spirit. However, as might be expected from such a man, there were no querulous repining. He thus writes to his most intimate friend, Dr. Holmes: "Do not believe me inclined to complain or to pass what remains of

life in feeble lamentations. When I think of all the blessings I have had and of the measure of this world's goods infinitely beyond my deservings that have been heaped upon me, I should despise myself if I should not find strength enough to bear the sorrows which the Omnipotent has now chosen to send."

The concluding years of his life, with the exception of a brief visit to America in 1875, were spent wholly in Europe and mostly in England. In the society of the large circle of his English friends he found comfort and sympathy in his afflictions, and the pathetic interest of the following passage from a letter addressed to Dean Stanley will be felt by every one:—"I wish it were in my power to tell you adequately how very grateful I am for the pleasure and solace which I have been deriving from your third volume on the Jewish Church. As I think I mentioned to you one day, if you had written the volume expressly for my own behalf it could not have been better adapted for the purpose, for it deals with subjects which exceedingly occupy my mind, and abounds with suggestions, explanations, and sympathetic aid towards the solution of problems and mysteries which press more and more upon the thoughts of those whose life's evening is closing in dark shadows and sorrows. You and I have both been struck almost simultaneously by that irremediable blow which drives the soul forth into the vast and unknown void, and causes it to rebel at times at the law which must restrain it so long as those mortal conditions last. I have been reading the book very slowly, for my mind wanders after attempting for a time to grasp great subjects, and I am obliged to take rest. How glad I am that your body and mind are both so vigorous and fresh, notwithstanding the great calamity that God has sent to you, and that you are not only able to find some relief in work but furnish relief to others.

"The delicate and masterly manner in which you have traced out the connection between the one invisible God revealing Himself at many intervals of space and time, and through different races to the highest of what we call human intellects, and the idea of a future life under unknown and unimaginable conditions, is to me most striking. Intense love seems to annihilate death, and love is the foundation of the Christian revelation."

He still continued to be interested in English politics, and this interest was strengthened by the marriage of his eldest daughter to Sir William Harcourt. His opinions, as we might expect, entirely coincided with those of his son-in-law on the great controversy of the day, the Eastern question. He thus expresses himself after reading one of those vigorous speeches with which then as now Mr. Gladstone's energetic lieutenant was wont to expose the follies and crimes of Tory policy:—"I read Harcourt's speech with great admiration and sympathy. I am glad that I could agree with every

word of it. I knew of course that it would be very eloquent, forcible and interesting, but I had not supposed that I should be so exactly in accord with all his views. I don't think it was at all superfluous for him to slay the slain, for these Turco-Dizzy people require a good deal of killing, and I am very glad that he has shown up in such masterful fashion the pitiful alternation of bumptiousness and backing down which has characterized the Tory Government during the past year."

His letters almost up to the moment of his death, May 1877, are full of allusions to the subject, and he expresses his keen apprehensions lest Lord Beaconsfield should succeed in bringing about a war between England and Russia, which he rightly regarded as one of the most deplorable calamities by which the world could ever be visited.

These memorials of a noble life are fitly closed by an extract from the general eulogy of the historian by his friend Dean Stanley, whose eloquence, always most conspicuous on such occasions, never rose to a higher flight than in these words:—"The hand of death has removed from among us one of the brightest lights of the Western hemisphere, the high-spirited patriot, the faithful friend of England's best and purest spirits, the brilliant, the indefatigable historian who told, as none before him had told, the history of the rise and struggle of the Dutch Republic, almost a part of his own. So long as the tale of the greatness of the House of Orange, of the siege of Leyden, of the tragedy of Barneveld, interests mankind, so long will Holland be indissolubly connected with the name of Motley in the union of the ancient culture of Europe with the aspirations of America which was so remarkable in the ardent, laborious soaring soul that has passed away. He loved that land of his with a passionate zeal, he loved the land of his adoption with a surpassing love. He loved the fatherland, the mother tongue of the literature which he had made his own.

"Whenever any gifted spirit passes from our own to the other, it brings both within our nearer view, the world of this mortal life, with its contentions and strifes, its joys and griefs, now to him closed for ever, but amidst which he won his fame, and in which his name shall long endure; and the other world of our ideal vision, of our inexhaustible longings, of our blank misgivings, of our inextinguishable hopes, of our everlasting reunions, the eternal love in which live the spirits of the just made perfect, the heavenly Jerusalem, which being above is free, the city of which God Himself is the light, and in whose light we shall see light."

SOME ECONOMIC ASPECTS OF THE EIGHT HOURS' MOVEMENT.

THE movement for a working-day of eight hours is one of the most recent of the many reforms proposed at the present day. It is a reform which possibly will have the deepest, if not perhaps the most apparent, effect not only upon our whole industrial system, but upon our commercial and national prosperity at large. For it would seem at first sight as if any limitation in the hours of labour would mean a limitation of the production of wealth in a country; and though we may not fall into the fallacy of certain older economists and believe that "wealth is everything and man is nothing," it must be admitted that an increase or decrease of national wealth forms a subject of serious consideration. It may be all very well to advocate an industrial or social reform, but before doing so we must always consider whether this reform is a luxury which in our present stage of industrial development we can afford, or whether after all we are not yet sufficiently advanced to proceed with it. It is upon this point that the discussion will really hinge, and in view of the *plébiscite* which is to take place among the trades' unions in the spring upon this subject, it may not be amiss to inquire what are likely to be the results of a general adoption of the eight hours' movement, and of legislative action in this direction. Being a question which apparently will deeply influence the productive capacity of the country, it is one which must of course be treated primarily from an economic standpoint.

The movement is very recent in its origin, although an eight hours' day is by no means a novelty in industrial England. The working-day in the fifteenth century was certainly not more than eight hours. We do not know whether the promoters of the present movement are aware of this fact, else it might prove a somewhat powerful argument in their hands. But leaving this matter of comparatively ancient history for the present, we may briefly note the steps of the modern movement. It really took formal shape only a very few years ago, although for some time past it had been known that "certain people were prepared to demand a considerable reduction in the hours of labour." The Miners' National Congress, held in Edinburgh in 1887, was the first public body to take the

matter up. At this Congress it was decided to urge on the agitation of this question. In the same year the Trades' Union Congress at Swansea also decided to ventilate the subject, and passed a resolution: "That in the opinion of the Congress the time has arrived when it is absolutely necessary that the workmen of this country should be called upon to express their wishes for or against an eight-hour day and a full Saturday holiday; and that the Parliamentary Committee be therefore instructed during the year to take a *plébiscite* of the members of the various trades' unions of the country upon this important question, and whether, if approved, such reduction of hours shall be brought about by the trades' unions themselves or by means of an Eight Hours' Labour Bill." The *plébiscite* thus demanded was instigated by the Parliamentary Committee, but had a very unsatisfactory result, chiefly owing to the way in which the committee worded the questions, which caused, we believe, considerable dissatisfaction among many prominent members of the unions. In consequence of this dissatisfaction the Congress held in 1888 at Bradford—at which the writer of this article was present as a deeply interested observer—ordered a fresh *plébiscite*, the result of which will shortly be made known. Meanwhile, the agitation has been going on in other quarters. The International Labour Congress, held at Paris in 1887 and at London in 1888, declared for a compulsory legal eight-hours' day. The movement has also proceeded with some activity in Spain and other European countries. It will be seen, however, from the above short sketch that the agitation is as yet only in its infancy. But considering the rapidity with which political and social movements make themselves felt in the present day, it is impossible to say how soon the question may not become one of practical politics.

It may be well then for us to consider why it is advocated, and what would be the probable economic results of the adoption of a legal working-day of eight hours only. It has been shrewdly remarked, we believe by Professor W. S. Jevons, that the leaders of the trades' unions are often right in their practical proposals, but generally wrong in the reasons they give for these reforms. We think that without any unfairness the same may be said of the promoters of the eight hours' movement. The main reason given for the advocacy of this labour reform is that it would find work for the unemployed, because in order to do the same amount of work in eight hours as was formerly done in ten hours, considerably more men would have to be taken on, and thus the unemployed would be drawn into continuous employment once more. That might at first indeed be the case, but the question is: how long would such employment continue? For, unless counteracting influences of a powerful nature were brought to bear, the rate of production would be very speedily checked and wages would fall to a considerable extent.

There is a very prevalent fallacy among the working classes (though it is by no means confined to them) that the limitation of labour will raise its price, and will cause the workman to obtain a larger share of his master's profits. It cannot be too often insisted upon and demonstrated that the whole wealth of a country, employers' profits and workmen's wages alike, come out of the products of labour, and if you limit by any means the quantity of this product there will be so much less both for employer and employed to share. Without falling into the ancient fallacy of the "wages fund" of the older economists, it is perfectly evident that the stock of wealth produced by labour is at any given time a definite quantity, and that from this stock of wealth are drawn the employer's profits, the capitalist's interest, the landlord's rent, and the workman's wages; and that if the most important element in this production voluntarily produces less, there will be in the future all the less wealth from which he can draw the reward of his labour. Such being the case, it is impossible that a mere reduction in the hours of labour can, of itself, give to the workmen a higher remuneration for that labour. It is principally then as a means of dealing with the distress in the labour world that this change is advocated. And as a corollary of this it is pointed out, with great truth, that the working classes would have additional leisure which would benefit them both mentally and physically. That they would have additional leisure is undoubted, and we think they would know how to use it wisely. The great advance in education and in general culture which has made itself felt of late years among the working classes, is a most encouraging sign to those who have seen the change actually going on around them; and if the additional facilities which it is said the movement will bring are used to the extent that may reasonably be hoped, the resulting progress of intellectual development among the workers will go a long way to compensate other disadvantages. But as a third reason for the movement it is stated that it would tend to equalize wealth, and here we are upon far less secure ground. That a certain equalization of wealth among us is desirable few, we think, will reasonably dispute. The contrast between Dives with his £20,000 a year and Lazarus with 10s. or even 20s. a week, is not indicative of a healthy economic life in the State. But whether the desired equalization will be effected by means of a reduction in the hours in which wealth is produced is a very doubtful question.

However, whatever may be the reasons given for the advocacy of an eight-hours' day, the question may safely be treated as largely an economic one, and as being in the main a question of wages—*i.e.*, a question of greater remuneration for labour and of more universal employment for those who desire to work, and it is on this ground that we propose now to consider it. Before plunging *in medias res* it is necessary first to consider the theory of wages. For even in

treating a practical question such as this, in which facts and statistics are so indispensable to a proper conclusion, we must nevertheless give a due place to theory, provided always that the theory be a true one, and extracted from, and not imposed upon, the facts.

The old economic theory of wages was simple enough, and although fallacious is by no means as yet defunct. It is generally called the theory of the "wages fund," and the best statement of the position assumed by its inventors is, we think, contained in one McCulloch's notes (vi.) to a passage in the *Wealth of Nations*: "That portion of the capital or wealth of a country," he says, "which the employers of labour intend, or are willing, to pay out in the purchase of labour may be much larger at one time than at another. But whatever may be its absolute magnitude it obviously forms the *only* source from which any portion of the wages of labour can be derived. No other fund is in existence from which the labourer, as such, can draw a single shilling: and hence *it follows* that the average rate of wages, or the share of the national capital appropriated to the employment of labour, falling at an average to each labourer must depend entirely upon its amount as compared with the number of those among whom it has to be divided." In other words, the amount of the wages of labour is the quotient in a division sum, the divisor of which is the numbers of the working classes, and the dividend the amount of capital in the country. The whole theory, it is easily seen, rests upon the assumption that wages are paid out of wealth that has already been set by as capital for this very purpose. Starting from this basis the older—and, for that matter, some of the more modern economists showed that all the capital of a country is divided into two parts—(1) auxiliary (*i.e.*, that which aids in industrial production, such as machinery, mills, means of transit, and so forth); and (2) remuneratory (*i.e.*, that which is devoted to the payment of wages to labour). The circumstances of a country determine in what proportion these two kinds of capital shall be divided. If much capital, for instance, is employed in the shape of mills and machinery, there will be so much the less capital to be given as the reward of labour. This theory naturally leads to the deduction, not only that wages depend upon the amount of remuneratory capital existing and the number of labourers, but also that "industry is limited by capital," which is a crude way of stating the facts of the case. The most unfortunate deduction, however, from the two propositions of the fixed wages fund and the limitation of industry by capital, was that any attempt of the working classes to improve their position and get more of the produce of their labour was useless, futile, and indeed positively harmful. No change or attempt on their part, it was said, can increase the wages fund, unless it either increases the total amount

of capital in the country, and this it is not likely to do, or unless it increases the remuneratory capital at the expense of the auxiliary, in which case industry would suffer and wages once more fall. Although co-operators and trades' unionists have brought the unanswerable logic of facts to disprove this theory, and although it has been seen that wages have risen without causing any evil effects to capital, there are a good many people still who in one way or another cling to this theory and condemn any attempts of the working classes to obtain higher wages. The influence of Ricardo and McCulloch is unfortunately not yet dead, and the present generation of economists has had to waste much of its time in clearing away the prejudices and mistakes of their predecessors. Mill, who at first believed in the theory, subsequently, however, was converted to a truer appreciation of the facts by the arguments of his friend Thornton. Professor Cliffe Leslie attacked it boldly, and adduced one or two very pertinent facts in support of his arguments. He pointed out that at the time of the potato famine in Ireland, when the population sank from 8,000,000 to 6,000,000, wages did not rise, although, according to the old theory, they ought to have done so, there being the same amount of capital to be divided among fewer people. Again, in new countries it is a remarkable fact that the remuneration of labour is always high, although the capital of such a country must necessarily be small. Professor Leslie's views are supported by Professor Thorold Rogers and the late Arnold Toynbee. And in fact it is abundantly evident that it is not true that any fixed portion of capital is set apart for the remuneration of labour. The true state of the case is that, at present and under our present industrial system, wages cannot be paid without capital, for they are often advanced, or apparently advanced, by capital. But it is not true that the amount of an employer's capital influences the amount of wages he pays his workpeople. He really repays them out of the produce of their labour, in some cases before that produce has become a marketable commodity, but in many cases not till long afterwards. The theory, in fact, was due largely to the special phenomena of the time of the industrial revolution (1780 onwards), when the amount of capital in the country was comparatively small, and the demand for it exceedingly large. And, finally, it looked at the wages question solely from the side of consumption and distribution.

Now, any adequate and true theory of wages must take account not only of the distribution and consumption of commodities, but also of their production. For, as we said above, it cannot be too clearly and too often insisted upon that wages are paid out of the continually growing product of labour, and from that alone. They may or may not be advanced by capital, but they are paid by labour. The amount of wages which the labourer receives depends—firstly, upon what Prof. F. Walker calls the "net disposable fund,"

produced by industry ; and secondly, upon the manner in which that produce is distributed. I think, by the way, that it would be best not to use the word "fund" at all in speaking of wages, lest a casual reader might imagine that after all we were falling into the old "wages-fund" fallacy. We will say then that wages depend upon the net amount of the produce of labour available for distribution, and upon the way in which it is distributed. Wages are that portion of the total produce of labour which the labourer can, by competition, custom, or otherwise, obtain for himself after the landlord, the capitalist, the employer, and the Government have got as much as they can for themselves in the shape of rent, interest, profits, and taxes respectively. Very often the labourer's portion is, after all these deductions, somewhat diminutive.

The bearing of this discussion on wages to the question of the eight hours' movement becomes perfectly evident when we ask ourselves, as economists, the two questions : How will the movement, if successful, influence the amount of the net disposable product ; and also, how will it affect the distribution of this product ? If we can answer these two questions satisfactorily, we need not trouble ourselves further about the results of the movement. We shall be able to afford it, and may await the consequences with security. If, however, we cannot answer them favourably, we must, for the time being at any rate, refuse it our support.

It may make the discussion clearer, perhaps, if we take the second question first, and inquire how far the movement will affect the distribution of the wealth produced by labour. And in doing so it must be borne in mind that here the question is practically a question of the raising of wages, for the rate of wages for eight hours' work is to remain the same as for the labour of ten or twelve hours, and this is of course the same thing as a higher rate of present remuneration. We have seen that the wealth produced by labour is distributed in the various forms of rent, interest, profits, taxation, and wages. If wages rise, some of these items must be encroached upon. Is this possible ? At the outset we think most decidedly that it is possible, and, indeed, is very probable. In one very gigantic and remarkable case it is being done to a considerable extent, and that is in the case of co-operation. But leaving this, we think it is putting the question very mildly to point out, and even to hope, that the item of rent may be very largely encroached upon indeed, without anybody being a penny the worse for it, except an unfortunate few who will have to learn to support existence on perhaps £5000, or even less, per year, instead of on £10,000 or £20,000. We do not know how many people are aware of the magnitude of this one item of rent in our national accounts, but we give the figures for the benefit of those who may be curious to know them. The total rent both of houses and of farm lands amounts to the huge sum of £180,000,000 per annum,

the former bringing in £70,000,000 and the latter £60,000,000. It used to be supposed among older economists that rent was a "fixed point" which it would be impious to assail. But alas! in these democratic days few things are sacred, and even rent may be attacked. Nor do we suppose that the result would be very disastrous.

Again, there is the item of interest, which it may be possible to reduce. Here we beg to state that we do not distinctly advocate any of these reductions or encroachments, but are merely considering what is possible, and indeed, from an economic point of view, extremely probable. It may be said, in answer to this suggestion, that the lowering of the rate of interest would be a deterring influence upon the accumulation of capital, and this would not be desirable. But in view of the fact that the present abnormally low rate of interest in England to-day does not seem to have any effect in that direction, it is doubtful whether this contemplated reduction of interest would at all 'deter' people from accumulation of capital. Here, however, another important consideration should be noticed, the more important because it would have a direct influence upon the working classes for whose benefit the hours of labour are to be reduced. In view of the fact that co-operative production is day by day coming to the front as a practical reality, anything which would possibly hinder the accumulation of capital, or would lower the rate of interest upon it when accumulated, would prove undesirable in the best interests of this form of industry. Above all things capital is needful for the working classes, whether they hope by peaceful combinations among themselves to develop a new form of industrial production, or whether they wish for funds to carry out successful (though most undesirable) combinations against capitalist employers under the present system. They should be careful, then, how they reduce the rate of interest, though we do not say that this would be impossible or even inexpedient.

The next item which suggests itself for the probable reductions which a raising of wages by the eight hours' movement would cause, is that of the profits of the employer. Here, again, recent experiments in co-operation, and especially co-operative production, have shown that this is possible. The instances of the late M. Godin's manufactory at Guise, and of the Hebden Bridge Co-operative Fustian Manufacturing Company in Yorkshire, are cases in point, to which it is impossible now to do more than refer generally. But it has been ingeniously remarked by a gentleman who lately read a very able paper on the eight hours' movement at Bradford, that to reduce employers' profits would, though possible, hardly be wise, because it is above all things necessary that our "captains of industry" should be men of the highest ability and mental power, and it is very doubtful whether such men would engage in the occupation of employers of labour unless high prizes, in the shape of

high profits, attracted them to this position. It certainly is a practical difficulty in the case of co-operative production that men of marked business ability prefer to take the chances, and with them the risks, of obtaining higher profits in a business of their own than to occupy the position of a paid manager of a "productive" enterprise at a fixed salary. But we certainly doubt whether the reduction of profits which presumably would be caused by higher wages would be so great as to deter men of ability from becoming manufacturers and merchants. There is, however, another important point that should not be overlooked in this connection, which is, that if the employers felt that their profits were being cut down they would most probably begin in their turn to trench upon the profits of the middlemen, and would certainly suck thereout no small advantage, besides very likely benefiting the community of producers and consumers at large. This is really the most probable result of the cutting down of the profits of the employer, and few would think in that case that much harm was being done.

The result, then, of our consideration as to whether the raising of wages induced by the eight hours' movement would affect the distribution of the wealth produced by labour, is that it probably would do so, and that in certain cases the effects would not by any means be disastrous. We now turn to the other question which presents itself forcibly to our notice: Will the movement increase or decrease the net amount of wealth produced by, and disposable for, labour? The answer is not to be given easily or lightly.

It is of course obvious that, supposing the present rate of production to be the same after the movement has succeeded, it will not be possible to produce as much wealth in eight hours as in ten or more. To keep production up at the present rate with diminished hours of labour, it will be necessary to resort to further means of doing as much as possible in a shorter space of time. That it will be possible to do this we may conclude upon a consideration of similar reductions in the hours of labour in the past. There is certainly considerably more wealth produced in our manufactories to-day than there was at the beginning, or even at the middle, of the century. Yet the hours of labour have been reduced far more sweepingly than it is proposed to reduce them now. At the beginning of the century young persons and little children were worked in the factories sixteen or even eighteen hours a day as a regular thing; occasionally more. Those who have studied the history of the Factory Acts are simply aghast at the fearful conditions of labour therein disclosed, and at the same time amazed at the endurance of which the workers of that day were capable. The penalty has been paid by their descendants, as those who live in the factory districts can testify. It was a far more violent step to reduce these long hours to ten per day than now to reduce the day from ten hours to eight. Yet production

has not suffered. The reason is that necessity, here as always, showed herself to be literally the mother of invention, and the decrease of hours was amply compensated by an increase of new machinery, appliances, and devices which have brought the development of the manufacturing industries up to the present point. Some fear that we have gone as far in our inventions as it is possible for us to go, and that if we were to reduce the hours of labour now we could no longer compensate by increased facilities of production. But we can hardly believe that this is the case. To take but one example: the steam-engine alone is as yet practically in its infancy, and one can hardly believe that there is no room for further invention when we remember that only ten per cent. of the power generated by coal in the steam-engine is utilized, while the remaining ninety per cent. is wasted. There might, indeed, be a temporary decrease in production, but it is almost certain that there would be sufficient stimulus of invention to meet the difficulty. It is astonishing how invention is called out or repressed by favourable or unfavourable circumstances. We are told that English inventiveness is largely due to free trade, while in Germany the effects of technical education are neutralized by the lack of invention caused by the fostering care of protection. On this point we should not like, however, to express a decided opinion.

The next great difficulty to be faced by the advocates of an eight-hours' day is that of foreign competition. It is asserted, apparently with some show of reason, that the proposed reduction would make it impossible for English employers, with men working only eight hours, to compete against foreign manufacturers whose employes work twelve, or even more, hours per day, and often on seven days of the week. This argument has been used before, at the time of the Factory Act agitation, and it cannot be said that it is, in view of the history of that and the present period, entirely successful. It is true that foreign competition must be considered, but whether it is the bogey that some would have us believe, we are inclined to doubt.¹ In spite of all we hear on this head, workmen's wages are better than they were forty years ago, and we do not think that employers are any worse off. And the fact that his Continental brother chooses to submit to long hours and degraded conditions of labour is certainly no reason why the English workman should also submit to the same yoke. It is a question, too, how long the Continental workman will consent to live and work as he does. There are many signs that the present state of things will not continue to exist much longer, nor is it desirable that they should. English workmen would, if they only

¹ Mulhall's Statistical Dictionary informs us that Great Britain, with a population of 36,000,000, produces wealth to the amount of £1,247,000,000 per annum; France, with 37,500,000 population, produces £965,000,000; Germany, with 45,000,000 population, produces £850,000,000; Russia, with 80,000,000 population, produces £760,000,000; and Austria, with 38,000,000 population, produces £492,000,000. England, with the smallest population and shorter hours of work than prevail abroad, produces by far the most wealth.

knew it, consult their own interest best, and at the same time do a good action to the Continental labourer, by sending picked men to agitate for a reduction of the hours of labour abroad, as well as by doing so at home. The English workman has already felt the benefit of shorter hours of labour than he was formerly accustomed to, and can produce better work than his Continental rivals, even when working the same machinery for a shorter time. This statement made to us by a high commercial authority, is a repetition of the evidence he gave before the Royal Commission on the Depression of Trade in 1885.

This question of shorter hours producing better work leads us to another aspect of the case. Might not the workman by working only eight hours a day, and having more leisure for educational or physical improvement, become so much more efficient that the gain here obtained would amply compensate for the fact that he was working a shorter time? Would not the gain in the quality of the work make up for the acknowledged loss in quantity? Of course, we may say in answer, this is possible, but whether the effect of the improved quality of the work would be felt before considerable loss has been inflicted on industry is a very grave question. For what guarantee is there that the emancipated workman would devote the two hours he had gained to a course, let us suppose, of technical education, or to a study of the present industrial system? We firmly believe that some of the most ardent advocates of the movement would do so, but we could hardly say as much for the rank and file of the working classes, at any rate as yet. But still this argument of increased efficiency in shorter time is by no means to be lightly disposed of, though we must confess that any results in this direction would be comparatively slow in coming. But it is certainly probable that, eventually at any rate, production would not greatly suffer.

Indeed, when we take a careful summary of the points which have come under our notice in trying to give an answer to the second of our two questions, it may be admitted that it does not appear on the whole that a reduction of the hours of labour to eight per day would seriously influence production, after the first natural shock and temporary loss that would be inflicted upon industry, before either the employers or the workmen had time to adjust themselves to the new state of things, and to compensate for the reduction in some other way. At the same time, the loss and shock here referred to might be much greater than is anticipated, and would inevitably be complicated by other industrial phenomena which could not now be foreseen. There is one of these phenomena, however, which we can foresee, and which must be taken into account, as being fraught with no small difficulty.

We come, in fact, once more to the ever-recurring problem of the unemployed in a new shape. It is one of the claims of the

advocates of the movement we are discussing, to which, we have alluded above, that the eight-hour day would result in a permanent relief of the distress now prevalent, because, of course, in order to keep up production at its present rate with the eight hours' limitation, considerably more hands would have to be employed than can at present find work. We are not at all sure of the efficacy of the reform as a relief for present distress, but granted that there would be suddenly created a large demand for what is now surplus labour, we should find that the employment of this labour is almost sure to have a far from salutary effect upon production. We should have, in many cases, though we do not say in all, the places of skilled workmen taken, or at least supplemented, by unskilled labourers. Mr. W. Abrahams, M.P., has calculated that there would be an immediate demand for something like 750,000 additional workers to keep up production at its present rate; "and you must remember," he said to the delegates at the Trades' Union Congress, "that the moment this large army, now enforced into idleness, once get work to do, there would be more consumers as well as producers." This is quite true; and the unemployed might be quite satisfactory as consumers, but would they be equally satisfactory in the capacity of producers of wealth? We must remember that comparatively few of them are skilled workmen, for there is still sufficient demand for skilled labour to prevent many such workers being idle. The majority are men who are out of work because they cannot adapt themselves—often through no fault of their own—to the only kinds of labour which happen to be open to them, and because they have no special skill to help them in the battle of industry. They are unfortunate, and we heartily sympathize with them. But it is no use disguising the fact that the importation of so much unskilled labour, quite suddenly, into skilled trades, may have a very disastrous effect in checking production in the very beginning of the movement, and thus diminish the net disposable amount of wealth to be shared by the workers. We do not say this is a difficulty which is to be considered insuperable, but it is certainly one which ought to make us very careful before committing ourselves unreservedly to the movement.

There are other considerations also which should influence us before quite making up our minds. We need a careful comparison of the statistics of English and foreign industry and wealth; and to fully examine these is a laborious, though most necessary, task. We may go back to the fifteenth century and declare that if an eight-hour day was sufficient for the production of wealth then, it ought to be sufficient now. But a comparison such as this is useless without a careful statistical calculation of the relative states of industry and wealth in that century and in our own. The examination of some of our Australian colonies, where an eight-hour day

is prevalent, would also be most useful. In fact, there are many considerations which should be taken into account before making a final decision. There is one to which we have not even alluded, and that is the question of how far, in this case as in others, we should allow State interference with labour. Could not the trades' unions be allowed to settle the matter by themselves without any intervention of Government? We must confess that we greatly prefer to see the English workman doing a thing for himself rather than calling to the State for aid, unless under exceptional circumstances. But when difficulties arise which he, unaided, cannot face alone, then the intervention of Government is not a matter of doctrinaire economics or of political theories, but becomes a question of expediency, which a careful consideration of the special circumstances of the case will doubtless enable us to solve. There is little doubt that the eight hours' movement will shortly be brought before us as a matter of practical politics. It is, we believe, largely due to a reaction against the terribly long hours of labour which are still prevalent in so many trades and occupations. The wrongs of the victims of the sweater, of overworked shop-assistants, of weary railway servants, of the slaves of Cradley Heath, and of many other toilers in our midst, are all so many arrows in the quiver of the eight hours' advocate, and he will presently use them with perhaps unforeseen energy and effect. Perhaps the movement, if successful, will not be so terrible in its effects as some seem to suppose. It will doubtless suffer various modifications in practice. A universal eight-hour day, for instance, would be impossible in many professions, although a maximum limit of eight hours would perhaps have the required effect. But questions such as these would find their natural solution when the time for action really came. As yet we are only discussing the subject, and are fully aware how many difficulties surround it, and how many obstacles have to be faced. We do not think that on the whole it would do any great harm to industry, and it certainly might do great and lasting good to the workers. But whether it will do good or not is a question to which the answer must be given by themselves, and upon themselves lies the responsibility.

A NEW READING OF THE BOOK OF JOB.

THE interpreter of the poetical books of the Old Testament has before him a double task. First of all there is a literal translation to be made. When this difficulty has been overcome, the result at the best is to place him in the position of a reader studying a book written in his own language. Then begins the second and more difficult part of his undertaking. It is not every English book that is easy for Englishmen to interpret, as witness *Hamlet* and *Sordello*. We may be able to construe every sentence in a poem, and yet feel utterly baffled when we attempt to divine the author's purpose and trace his plan. This, however, is what our ideal interpreter must do before he can rest satisfied with his work completed.

And here we must draw a distinction. In most, perhaps in all works of imaginative genius, there are latent meanings, thoughts suggested of which the author himself may never have dreamed, ideas that slumber unperceived till some stranger enters the enchanted palace and wakes them into life, secret doors the builder never designed, that nevertheless fly open before the Sesame of some adventurous soul; but a specific meaning, a purpose the writer must certainly have had, and it is surely a very imperfect method of study that ignores the obvious in its pursuit of the recondite.

To apply these principles to the study of the Book of Job. For the translation those who are not Hebraists, must depend on the result of others' labours. But at the present day we are so well provided with translations and commentaries that a profound knowledge of the original is no longer necessary for the student who desires to investigate the author's purpose and plan. Readers, indeed, who were restricted to the Authorised Version, might well give up such an attempt in despair, for in scores of passages the mis-translations seriously affect the meaning, and in some cases turn the argument into absolute nonsense. Now, however, with a Revised Version, in which sense is not sacrificed to sound, and with the translations of Ewald, Delitzsch, Renan, Rodwell, Cox, and Wright, to say nothing of the Commentaries, the first part of the interpreter's task may be said to be accomplished, and the way prepared for an attempt to complete it from the literary rather than from the philological side. There are, of

course, plenty of texts on which difference of opinion still exists, but these do not affect the larger and more important question with which we now propose to deal.

There are certain matters connected with the book which have greatly exercised the minds of the commentators. When it was written, who was the author, whether it is to be read as literal fact, or story founded on fact, or pure invention—all these questions have been debated at much length and with vast learning; especially by those Gibeonites of literature, the German critics.

Without entering into these discussions, we will simply state here the conclusions at which we have arrived, so far as they bear on the subject of the meaning of the poem.

It seems to us clear from the internal evidence that the date cannot be earlier than the time of Solomon, and may be considerably later.

As to the basis of the story it appears to us most probable that the poet has availed himself of a familiar tradition, with quite possibly a foundation of historic truth, embodying the story of a righteous man, who, after enduring with fortitude the strokes of apparently unmerited trouble, emerged triumphant out of all his troubles. If this view be correct, a modern parallel may be found in the allegorical treatment by Walter Map and Tennyson of the King-Arthur Legends.

Having thus cleared the ground of these preliminary matters, we come now to the proper subject of this article—what was the purpose and plan of the author of the Book of Job?

If we consult the commentators, we find something like a practical unanimity among them. Thus Delitzsch says, "Why do afflictions upon afflictions befall the righteous man? This is the question the answering of which is made the theme of the Book of Job."¹

Hengstenberg considers the theme of the book to be "the sufferings of the righteous, how they are to be explained and shown to be consistent with the Divine righteousness."²

Ewald commences his Commentary thus: "It is easy to see from the first glance at the book that the poet is making the evils which afflict mortals the subject of his consideration. He found the view which had prevailed from of old down to his own times already self-contradictory, and he attempted a profounder solution of the conflicting principles."³

To the same effect Dr. A. B. Davidson writes: "It was the author's purpose to widen men's views of God's providence, and to set before them a new view of suffering."⁴

"The burden of the drama," says Mr. Froude, "is not that we do, but what we do not and cannot, know the mystery of the govern-

¹ *Commentary on Job* (Clarke's For. Theol. Lib.), vol. i. p. 1.

² *Lectures on Job* (Clarke's For. Theol. Lib.), series iii. vol. vi.

³ *Commentary on Job*, p. 1.

⁴ *Commentary on Job* (Cambridge Bible), p. xxv.

ment of the world ; that it is not for man to seek it, or for God to reveal it."¹

Kuenen's view approximates to that of Mr. Froude. The purpose of the book he takes to be the exhibition of suffering as an insoluble problem—insoluble because the Divine ways are inscrutable.

Now it is perfectly obvious that there must be some strong reason behind this substantial unanimity, and, as a matter of fact, the story of the poem is unmistakably concerned with the problem of suffering. It is equally certain that the speeches of Job and his friends deal with the same question. When to this is added the New Testament reference, "Ye have heard of the patience of Job," it is not very wonderful that the nature or solution of the problem has been assumed to be the subject of the poem.

But the difficulties that stand in the way of this interpretation are almost as obvious. As Dr. Davidson remarks, "Almost every theory that has been adopted has found itself in collision with one or more of the parts of which the book now consists."

Extreme ingenuity has been shown in minimizing difficulties and reconciling inconsistencies, but too often the ingenuity of the explanation is the exact measure of its improbability.

The substantial objections to the ordinary view may be thus summarized :—

1. The "New Truth" which the author is supposed to unfold is that the object of suffering may be disciplinary and not merely punitive. * But if the date generally assigned by critics be the true one, there surely could hardly have been any novelty in this truth then. It is one of the most elementary of spiritual truths. The patriarchal stories are full of it ; the lives of Abraham, of Jacob, and Joseph are in different ways prolonged illustrations of it. Nay, it was spiritual knowledge not confined to the Jew. Plato, in a noble passage,¹ explains how in the successions of life and death the virtuous soul is by virtue of the law of like to like drawn ever upwards, while the evil soul sinks lower. And this, he continues, explains the apparent anomaly of the wicked man's temporary prosperity. It is obvious that the same reasoning would furnish substantially the same answer as that which the author of the Book of Job is supposed to be unfolding.

2. If this be so, it is hard to see what other new light is thrown upon the problem, except indirectly. The Divine speeches may be interpreted as an answer to Job's perplexities and doubts, but then it is an answer which must have occurred to thousands of pious hearts before. That God being so great, His ways are past finding out, is true in a sense, and in that sense is another of those elementary truths which hardly needed a sponsor in the days of the Hebrew monarchy.

¹ *Short Studies on Great Subjects*, vol. i. p. 329.

3. Again, assuming that the problem of undeserved suffering is the theme of the poem, the long and elaborate debate between Job and his friends seems out of place, or at any rate out of proportion. Their theory is perfectly simple, and hardly needed, one would have thought, an eight-fold repetition. If the writer's purpose had been to correct an erroneous view, one of the eight statements, together with a single rejoinder on the part of Job, would have been ample. Moreover, it must be noticed that, as far as the problem is concerned, the debate adds to instead of removing the difficulties. For the theory with which Job meets his "comforters" is the appalling one that suffering is inflicted by God, not as discipline, not even as punishment, but as torture. In fact, the author has carefully subjected his hero to conditions which make it impossible for him to work out the answer. He fully believes his disease must end in death. At the same time his hope of immortality is vague and spasmodic. But his belief in his own integrity and uprightness is absolute, and, as the author has taken care to assure us, well founded. Under these circumstances, how could he believe that his sufferings were but the means to a gracious end? He might have used the words of a modern poet, and said,

"'Twere imbecile hewing out roads to a wall,"

for, like a wall, the immediate prospect of death, with darkness beyond stared him in the face. Nor do his final utterances show that he had consciously solved the problem of unmerited affliction.

4. The same considerations apply in great part to the Divine speeches. Plainly they contain no more direct reference to the supposed problem of the book than do Job's answering sentences. Indirectly they may be meant to apply, but so might almost any words that pious hearts have placed upon the lips of the great Father. There are a dozen psalms, any one of which might, by the exercise of a little ingenuity, be construed to an answer to Job's perplexity. But when the closeness of question and repartee in the colloquies is borne in mind, it seems very improbable that the same writer would make the final utterance of all so vague and indefinite in character.

5. Lastly, when we read the poem with the supposed clue in our hands, we cannot help feeling a sense of disappointment, almost of bewilderment. There is a want of that artistic unity, that coherence and harmony of parts, which generally accompanies and indicates true genius. We are forced to consider whether our clue can be the correct one, or whether we must not seek for another that may lead us through unexplored passages to the very heart of the edifice.

Is there such a clue? The purpose of the author was obviously didactic. What was the lesson he sought to enforce, the truth he was anxious to impart?

As we read the poem, one peculiarity of the poet is so marked, no one could possibly fail to notice it. Here is a man whose eyes are for ever on the world around him, the world of nature. Every argument, every threat, every promise is illustrated and enforced by an appeal to its wonders—Job, Eliphaz, Bildad, Zophar, the Divine Being Himself, all have recourse to the same unfailing armoury. And it is when the poet rises to his highest strain, when he is consciously exerting his powers to the utmost, it is just then he employs the images drawn from nature with the most lavish splendour.

Now what does this indicate? What does it reveal to us of the writer's personality?

This, at least, we answer: that we have here to do with one of those men to whom nature is more than a vast catalogue of names, more than a museum of interesting objects, more than a means of acquiring knowledge—to whom it is as a holy place, the ante-chamber of that Holiest where, within the veil, the Divine Mystery is hidden. This is a man who, by searching, has found out God, has met Him face to face under the leafy covert, by the broad river side, or in the solemn stretches of the great waterless desert. Such experiences do not leave a man as they find him. Henceforth there is within his heart a never-failing spring of sincerity that will spread its fertilizing influences far and wide. What has been said of John the Baptist may have been true of this man:

"He had seen in mighty Lebanon
The cedars no man's axe hath lit upon;
And he had often worshipped, falling down
In dazzling temples opened straight to him,
Where One who hath great lightnings for His crown,
Was suddenly made present, vast and dim,
Through crowded pinions of the Cherubim."¹

Now imagine such a man surrounded by the unbelievers who appear in some of the Psalms, or the formalists and hypocrites against whom Isaiah thundered. He has learned that, as he masters himself, and schools his life to purity and gentleness, in that proportion does his knowledge of, and communion with God become larger and closer. From his own deepest experience he has gained the conviction that, sooner or later, God will reveal himself to the upright man who cleaves to his integrity and seeks after him with singleness of heart. A thousand times he must have come into collision with the formalists. Their rigid systems, their dry bones of traditional belief, had nothing in common with the living energy of his self-discovered truth. They denounced him as an audacious heretic, and the Book of Job is his apologia.

¹ A. O'Shaughnessy, "The Daughter of Herodias."

In choosing the form of his poem, it is easy to see how his anxiety to vindicate his view of truth, would naturally lead a man of his bold and original genius towards the dramatic. Formalism, or as we sometimes call it, "orthodoxy," has one spirit, but many shapes. Sometimes it assumes the air of venerable authority, and, wrapping itself in the mantle of the seer, laments the degeneracy of those who differ from it. Sometimes it seeks to crush its opponents by weight of ancient learning and precedent, or again it glows with the unhallowed flame of harsh intolerance and passionate invective. In all these varieties our poet must have come in contact with it, and accordingly all are represented here. Eliphaz, Bildad, Zophar, the aged, the learned, the hot-tempered formalist, all have their say: the weakness of their arguments is unsparingly exposed, and, finally, the Divine condemnation is levelled at them—not for their treatment of their friend, but because "*Ye have not spoken of me the thing which is right, as my servant Job hath.*"

Now, the range of subjects on which the formalist dogmatizes is co-extensive with the religious life itself. Everywhere he stands ready to proclaim the correct belief, and the exact limits of lawful inquiry. Hence his assailant has a wide choice. Religious observances, social inequalities, revelation, rewards, and punishments—on any one of these subjects the battle may be fought. What decided our poet's choice we cannot determine. It may have been something in his own experience of suffering, it may have been that he saw in the legend of the righteous Job an instrument ready to his hand; whatever the circumstances may have been, the important thing to remember is that the problem of suffering is chosen, not because the poet has found, or is seeking for, any new explanation of it, but merely as a battle-ground on which the contest between eager truth and inveterate bigotry may once more be fought out. In other words, Job is busied with the "mystery of pain," but not the author of the poem. His purpose was altogether different.

Let us then see the use he has made of the legend. The story is told in the prologue, and the origin of Job's afflictions is there accounted for. The apparent absurdity of solving the problem before stating it has been explained as an instance of the difference between Eastern and Western habits of thought. The true explanation, however, if the view we are putting forward is correct, is far simpler—no new solution is suggested or intended. The same dramatic instinct that is afterwards shown in the colloquies appears also in the conversation between God and Satan. But apart from the pomp and circumstance with which the poet's imagination has invested the scene, two things stand out in strong relief: (1) The perfect righteousness of Job, which is vouched for by the Almighty;

(2) The trial that is to be made of his loyalty to God, upon which the reader's attention is to be riveted.

There is a phrase the fourfold repetition of which in this short prologue can hardly be accidental. When Job is introduced at the height of his prosperity we find him offering sacrifice lest his sons, amid the temptations of ease and luxury, should have "*renounced God*" in their hearts. When the Satan challenges the virtue of Job, the challenge ends each time with the triumphant prophecy, "*he will renounce Thee to Thy face,*" and finally Job's nearest and closest companion is made to reveal her own fall, and to a certain extent justify his adversary's forecast by the counsel she gives, "*Renounce God, and die.*"

The relation of the individual soul to God. That is the ultimate problem of all religion. To cleave to Him, though with blind eyes, faltering foot, and fainting heart, that, in our poet's view, is success; to renounce Him, that is failure. To Job's sons the trial had come in the shape of prosperity; to Job himself it was to take the form of calamity. But the affliction is only the machinery by which the allegiance of Job is to be tested. The question the author means his readers to be asking all through the poem is, not why does God permit these troubles to assail the righteous?—he has anticipated that query, and given his answer in the prologue; but, what will be their effect upon him in his relations to the Almighty? Assuming that the conditions of his trial make it impossible for him to arrive at the solution furnished in the prologue, will he be driven to renounce God? This is left in doubt to the very end, and to these questions the final utterances of God and of Job offer a precise and a satisfactory answer. Another purpose served by the prologue is to lead up to the initial outburst of uncontrollable anguish and half-unconscious complaining with which the colloquies begin. Job's utterance under his first trial is spontaneous and strong. He can still say, "Blessed be the name of the Lord." "In all this," adds the poet, "Job sinned not." Then comes the second trial. Here the writer is describing an affliction with which he was probably only too familiar. It is leprosy, the most terrible of diseases to the Jewish mind, not merely because of its own intrinsic horrors, but because of the close association between it and sin. This time Job receives his doom in silence. Only when the disease has reached an apparently hopeless stage, and his wife breaks in with her coarse blunt counsel, "Renounce God and die," only then does the habit of faith come to his aid, and prompt the words, "Shall we receive good at the hand of God, and shall we not receive evil?" Obviously these words mark a decline. They express not so much a strong and buoyant trust, as an attempt to rehabilitate a weak and wavering faith. There is no "Blessed be the name of the Lord" now.

And the poet significantly changes his form of words this time: "In all this, did not Job sin *with his lips*."

Again we must suppose an interval of time to have elapsed. The friends have come from far, and news—even bad news—would travel slowly then. By the time they have arrived Job is in a pitiable state indeed. So disfigured as to be almost unrecognizable, the laughing-stock of the rude village children, penniless, houseless, childless, so low has fallen "the greatest of all the men of the east." Dumbfounded at the sight of his suffering and the signs of his grief, the friends sit silent for seven days and nights. At length the fountains of the deep are broken up, and the rain of words begins. The thoughts that have been revolving in the sufferer's mind take definite shape, and are clothed in words. Speech leads to speech, and so from the 3rd to the 26th chapter the contest is waged.

Into the details of the discussion we do not propose to enter. The following are the principal points that bear on our present subject:—

(1) There is no attempt to caricature or ridicule the friends. They come before us as men of unblemished character and high attainments, sincerely desirous of seeing their friend's restoration to prosperity. Zophar, the most intolerant of the three, dwells with poetic fervour on that restoration. Eliphaz shows himself keenly alive, even at the end of the fierce controversy, to Job's pathetic appeal, "Have pity upon me, have pity upon me, O my friends,"¹ and recurs in his last speech to that vision of renewed felicity which is not referred to in the second round of speeches. If they are harsh and unjust, and foolish in their treatment of their friend, it is, we are made to feel, their wrong conception of God, and their obstinate refusal to entertain new views of truth, that are the causes of their failure. It is one of the marks of power in a controversialist that he never stoops to misrepresent his opponents. Just as Goethe, while scoffing at the pedantry of which Wagner is the type, still puts into his mouth words that make us doubt, whether we ought not to admire the pedant,² so does our poet represent the friends upright, gifted, eloquent.

(2) Another noticeable feature is the startling boldness of the language put into Job's mouth when we remember what the Divine verdict is to be—that Job hath spoken of Me the thing that is right. It is true Job does excuse himself on the ground of his desperation,³ but that excuse is offered at the beginning of the colloquies, before the prim orthodoxy of the friends had driven him to the frankest, bluntest expression of his doubts and conjectures. In the very same

¹ Chap. xix. 21.

² "Mit eifer hab' ich mich der Studien beflissen
Zwar weiss ich viel, doch möchte ich alles wissen."

Faust, 600-1.

³ Chap. vi. 26.

speech the thought of his imminent death drives him to demand of the Almighty, with a half angry, half mournful irony :

“ Am I the sea, or the sea-monster,
That Thou settest a watch over me ? ”

Still more bitterly he echoes, with a significant difference, the words of the grateful Psalmist, “ What is man that Thou art mindful of him ? ” Nay, rather, asks Job, what is man, that Thou shouldst devote Thyself to persecuting him ? In his next speech the effect of Bildad’s dogmatic statements, supported as they were by the appeal to authority, is apparent in the increasing boldness of Job’s language. The unfairness of the contest between Omnipotence on the one hand, and the poor dying leper on the other, is now his theme. What chance is there for him, he asks :

“ If I were perfect, He would make me out perverse.”

And then, in a proud burst of confidence—justified always, be it remembered, by the fact of his uprightness—he adds—

“ I am perfect.”

Now, one upon another, the hot words pour forth :—

“ It is all one, therefore I say,
He destroyeth the perfect and the wicked alike.
In the hour of misfortune
He mocketh at the despair of the innocent,
The earth is given into the hands of the wicked.”

A little later, after several daring conjectures as to the cause of his afflictions, he adopts the terrible theory that God created and preserved him with the express design of afflicting him whether innocent or guilty.

“ I know this was Thy purpose :
If I sinned, then Thou wouldst mark me
If I sinned greatly—Woe unto me ;
And were I righteous, yet must I not lift up my head.

* * * * *

‘ If I did, thou wouldst hunt me as a fierce lion.”

(3) But however bold, and even audacious, Job’s language may be, it seems clear the author did not mean to represent his utterances as the ravings of a disordered mind. For it is noticeable that the intellectual victory always rests with him, never with the friends. Bildad’s brief utterance, and Zophar’s default in the third colloquy, are the outward and visible signs of their defeat. It was no madman that could reduce to silence these travelled learned sages.

(4) Again, it is important to observe that Job’s references to immortality are transient. Deeply interesting, profoundly touching as these references are, it is plain that the book was not written as a setting for them. They do not appear in Job’s final speech, nor are they referred to in the utterances of the Almighty.

(5) Finally, we must always remember that Job, even in his darkest hours, never fulfils the adversary's prophecy—never renounces God. It never occurs to him to doubt either the existence or the omnipotence of the Divine Being. When he is insisting most strenuously on his own righteousness, and thus by inference arraigning the justice of God, his greatest longing is for a reconciliation with Him.

"Oh that Thou wouldst hide me in Sheol,
That Thou wouldst keep me secret till Thy wrath be past,
That Thou wouldst appoint me a set time, and then remember me.

* * * * *
All that appointed time would I wait
Till my release came;
Thou wouldst call and I would answer Thee,
Thou wouldst have a desire to the work of Thine hands."

And even when that hope grows dim, when he feels himself driven to the conclusion that the God who afflicts him is unappeasable and irreconcilable, even then he appeals from the God who afflicts to the God who will see him righted.

"Even now, behold my witness is in heaven,"
"And my voucher on high.

* * * * *
Mine eye poureth out tears unto God,
That He would maintain the right of a man with God."

It is this "Witness" who will one day vindicate his memory, and the inspiring thought kindles in him the faith that, though dead, he shall still behold his Champion.

"But I know that my vindicator liveth,
And in the time to come He shall stand upon my grave,
And after this my skin is destroyed
Without my flesh shall I see God:
Whom I shall see for myself,
And mine eyes shall behold and not another."

It is true that in his reply to Eliphaz's final speech he recurs to the old cry of injustice, for he knows his own innocence, and it seems to him, if only he could find his invisible adversary, he himself could successfully plead his own cause. But in the main his subsequent speeches are confined to answering the arguments of his opponents.

It is when we leave the colloquies, and come to Job's soliloquy, that the author's purpose begins to be most clearly manifest. Hitherto we have seen, on the one hand, the righteous man true to himself, and yet clinging with desperate earnestness to the God whose ways he cannot fathom; on the other, the champions of orthodoxy, with their "empty chaff well-meant for grain." The contest is over. Job is victorious, and in the four chapters, xxvii.

to xxx., he "draws his singing robes around him," and sums up his deliberate conclusions.

With characteristic art the poet commences this section of the poem by placing the opposing views in the sharpest possible contrast. Job begins with a solemn and positive assertion of his innocence. He has lost everything else, but

"My righteousness I hold fast, and will not let it go."

Having this treasure, he envies not the wicked, for that faint but glorious hope, which once and again had brought light into his darkest gloom, they could never know. Clearly then, at the end of the trial Job has not renounced God. He still cherishes the undefined hope of some final good. But how is the earthly prosperity of the wicked, and the affliction of the righteous, to be explained? "I will teach you concerning the ways of God," says Job, "your explanation is false, for facts contradict it;" and then, following the method he has previously adopted, he sums up and concentrates their statements as to the fate of evil. His own explanation is very different. In a marvellous passage, which recalls the "*πολλὰ τὰ δεινὰ*" of the *Antigone*, he extols the skill and perseverance of man who can bring to light the secrets of nature. Sapphire, and ruby, and gold cannot escape him. He finds out their darkest hiding places, though

"That path no eagle knoweth,
And the vulture's eye hath not seen it,
The proud beasts have not trodden it
Nor the fierce lion passed by it."

But one thing baffles even man's ingenuity—Wisdom, the Divine plan and order of the universe—where shall that be found? To know this, it seems to poor tortured Job, would be the height of bliss, but

"It is hidden from the eyes of all living,
And kept close from the fowls of the air,
Destruction and Death can only say
We have heard a rumour of it."

God alone knoweth it, and he has fixed by a primal immutable decree the narrow limits of man's vision. To fear the Lord and to depart from evil, that is man's necessary knowledge; for more light, it is useless to ask or yearn.

This, then, represents the issue of the trial on Job from the intellectual side. Its moral effect is revealed in the remaining chapters of the soliloquy. The depressing conclusion at which he had just arrived naturally suggested, by force of contrast, the thought of his former happiness, when, unvexed by any clouds of misery and mystery, he enjoyed the smile of heaven and the reverence of his fellows. A touch, or more than a touch, of self-complacency enters into the retrospect. But "A sorrow's crown of sorrow is remembering happier things." His present wretchedness is accentuated by the thought of

the joyful past. In bitterness of spirit he reviews one by one his afflictions. The contempt of those who had once been his humblest dependents, his physical anguish, the imminence of death, the unexpected nature of his troubles, the loathsomeness of his appearance—all these are enumerated. And then, recurring to what, in his own eyes, as well as those of his friends, would seem to be the natural explanation of his troubles, he solemnly clears himself of well-nigh every sin that could be laid to his charge. The self-complacency becomes almost sublime audacity.

“Behold my challenge. Let the Almighty answer me,
Would that I had the charge that my adversary hath written,
I would carry it openly with pride,

* * * * *

As a prince would I go near unto Him.”

One more possible charge strikes him, and he hastens to anticipate it:

“If I acquired my land by theft or violence,
Let thistles grow instead of wheat,
And cockles instead of barley,
The words of Job are ended.”

And now, with admirable skill, the poet has created his opportunity. The truth, which is as old as the earth itself, but which was new to him, as it was, centuries later, to Wordsworth, as it is to every man who passes through a like experience, that truth he was eager to unfold. The overwhelming greatness of the Creator, and His manifest presence in creation, this was his message. Hence the two main features of the Divine speeches. The fuller revelation of Himself in nature vouchsafed by God to the faithful seeker after Him, that is one feature; the contrast between the unimaginable grandeur of God and the insignificance of man even at his best, that is the other. In one and the same moment Job receives the reward of his faithfulness and the rebuke for his presumption. The grave irony of the rebuke runs throughout the speeches, and is unmistakable, but wherein does the reward consist?

To answer this question we must recur to Job's soliloquy. His conclusion has been that God's plan, His way of working in the world, is an insoluble mystery. Except a spark of light, absolutely needful for the guidance of man, all is darkness. It is this gloomily philosophy which is now distinctly traversed. “Come forth out of the darkness of the mire in which you have been groping,” such is the message of the Theophany, “and see Me revealed in My works.” The wonders of inanimate creation are passed rapidly in review. All these bear the impress of a ceaseless activity, a boundless energy, an unerring foresight. Nay, they tell of more. They tell also of an all-embracing love.

"Who hath divided a watercourse for the overflowing of waters

* * * *

To cause it to rain on the earth where no man is,
On the wilderness wherein there is no man,
To satisfy the desolate and waste ground
And to cause the seed of the tender herb to spring forth?"

Turning to the world of life, the poet repeats the lesson:—

"Who provideth for the raven his food
When his young ones cry unto God
And wander without meat?"

The series of pictures which follows is deservedly reckoned among the highest efforts of the author's genius. For their naturalness, for the naïve delight the writer shows in his subject, for the sympathetic insight by which they are lit up, they are probably unmatched in the literature of the world. The lion, the raven, the wild goat, the bison, the ostrich, the horse, the hawk, the eagle—it is with the rapture of a true Nature-lover that the poet dwells fondly over his delineations. Sometimes it almost seems as if he lost sight of his didactic purpose as he contemplates the variety and splendour of life before him. The best modern parallels in spirit to these Nature-pictures seem to me to be found in Blake's often-quoted "Tiger, tiger burning bright," and in the following poem by a gifted American writer, whose name is far less known here than it deserves to be—Mrs. Celia Thaxter:—

LEVIATHAN.

- "Betwixt the bleak rock and the barren shore
Rolled miles of hoary waves that hissed with frost,
And from the bitter north with sullen roar
Swept the wild wind, and the wild water tossed.
- "In the cold sky, hard, pitiless, and drear,
The sun dropped down; but ere the world grew gray,
A sweet reluctant rose-tint, sad and clear,
Stained icy crags and leagues of leaping spray.
- "Midway between the lone rock and the shore
A fountain fair sprang skyward suddenly,
And sudden fell, and yet again once more
The column rose, and sank into the sea.
- "Silent, ethereal, mystic, delicate,
Flushed with delicious glow of fading rose,
It grew and vanished, like some genie great,
Some wild thin phantom, woven of winter snows.
- "'Twas the foam-fountain of the mighty whale,
Rising each time more far and faint and dim.
All his huge strength against the thundering gale
He set; no hurricane could hinder him!

“There came to me a gladness in the sight,
A pleasure in the thought of life so strong,
Daring the elements, and making light
Of winter's wrathful power of wreck and wrong.

“I gloried in his triumph o'er the vast
Blind rage of Nature. All her awful force,
The terror of her tempest full she cast
Against him, yet he kept his ponderous course.

“For her worst fury he nor stayed nor turned,
’Twas joy to think in such tremendous play,
Through the sea's cruelty, all unconcerned
Leviathan pursued his placid way.”

After the splendid portraits of the eagle and war horse, there is a break in the Divine speech. The Lord turns to him who had so proudly challenged his Maker, and asks:—

“Will the reprover contend with the Almighty?”

The answer shows that one purpose at least of the Lord's speech had been answered:—

“Then Job answered the Lord and said:
‘Behold I am too mean; what shall I answer Thee?
I lay my hand upon my mouth.’”

Once more the Divine voice is heard, and now the powerlessness of man to influence the moral government of the world is the theme. The prosperity of the wicked, that old problem which had so vexed the spirit of Job, one thing is clear with reference to it, the action of man cannot solve it. Men cannot at one fell swoop abase the proud and tread down the wicked. Was Job right, then, after all? Is there no light to be thrown on the darkness of such mysteries? “Come forth,” again cries the poet, “come forth into the kingdom of Nature, behold the ways of God in His works.” But now the poet's method is changed in correspondence with a change in his purpose. In the first part of the Theophany, Job had been overwhelmed by a rapid glance at the whole vista of Creation, and made to feel his own utter insignificance. Now, with this mingles a new thought. Job must realize the far-reaching intelligence that works to the perfection of apparently trivial details. Hence the altered manner of description, which has been pointed to as evidence of a divided authorship, but which is—regard being had to the purpose of the Theophany—a strong argument for its unity. Two creatures are selected as the strongest and most terrible in the garden of the Lord—Behemoth, “the chief of the ways of God,” and Leviathan, the “king over all the children of pride.” Into the minutiae of their structure the poet enters with a curious but delighted particularity. And when the long catalogue of God-revealing wonders are exhausted, the answer of Job shows very plainly the author's intention.

"Then Job answered and said,
I know that Thou canst do everything,
And that no purpose is beyond Thee.

* * *

I spoke words whose meaning I understood not,
Things too wonderful for me,
I had heard of Thee by the hearing of the ear,
But now mine eye seeth Thee."

The long conflict is over, and through the portals of a complete self-abasement Job rises to the serene heights of unclouded communion with the author of his being.

So far, we may be sure we have been following the experiences of an actual struggling human soul. It is no creation of fancy, this record of ebbing and flowing faith, but the self-revelation of one who has suffered and striven, and at last attained. The epilogue in all probability simply follows the tradition on which the poem is based. And in the minute details of the last chapter one can see the artist's hand giving verisimilitude to the ancient story. There is, of course, nothing inconsistent with Job's true reward in his restored prosperity. His wealth and dignity had been taken away for a specific purpose. That purpose satisfied, it is in perfect accord with the spirit of the poem that they should be given back to him.

The author of *Natural Religion* has, in a brief but pregnant passage, stated his view of the poem and its teaching:—

"The Scriptures are full of passages expressing in poetic forms, and in language suited to another age, the spirit of modern science. Notably the Book of Job, not in occasional passages only, but as its main object and drift, contrasts the conventional and, as it were, orthodox view of the universe with the view which those obtain who are prepared to face its awfulness directly."¹

The language is somewhat vague, but it seems to imply that the author of the Book of Job was animated by the spirit of modern science. This appears to us an entire misconception. It is true that he and many modern scientists would probably alike claim to be "lovers of nature." But the phrase "lover of nature" is a wide one, and would cover ideas essentially different. Between a vivisector's love of nature, and a poet's, there is a gulf fixed as wide as that which separated Dives from Lazarus, a difference as great as exists between the Belfast address of Professor Tyndall and the "Lines composed above Tintern." There may be a difference of opinion as to which is the truer and nobler view, but to treat them as identical is surely a grave mistake. "Knowledge at any price," "Knowledge for the sake of knowledge," these are the watchwords of modern science. But in Job the standpoint is wholly different. Knowledge gained at the cost of "renouncing God?"—this would be, in the emphatic words of a later Hebrew

¹ *Natural Religion*, p. 10.

writer, "vapour and a feeding upon wind." Knowledge is precious, but only as it enables man to understand, to feel, to see Him who, to the unintelligent mind and unenlightened eye, is and must remain invisible. The phenomena of nature are the clearest revelation of Him; therefore let a man give himself to the contemplation of them.

We have left out of account the speeches of Elihu. The fact that no reference is made to him in the Divine speeches or in the epilogue appears to us conclusive as to its place in the poem. And the internal evidence from the speech itself points in the same direction. The position it occupies in the poem indicates the object of its insertion. It comes, it will be noticed, between the end of Job's soliloquy and the commencement of the Divine speech—between, that is to say, Job's assertion of innocence and the appeal to Nature. Now, when we look in detail at Elihu's utterance, we find that he commences his argument by dealing with Job's self-justification, and then, after replying to other arguments used by Job, reaches the conclusion—

"Behold God is great and we know Him not."¹

Thence he naturally passes to the manifestation of that greatness in the works of Nature. In other words, his speech is an elaborate correlation of Job's final, and the Divine initial, sentences. It is the work of some later writer, with possibly a keener intellect but certainly a feebler imagination. Missing the point of the Lord's speech, he felt there was a hiatus. Job puts to silence the three friends, but many of his own audacious utterances are suffered to go unrefuted. Nay, was there not a danger lest the Divine approval should be supposed to sanction those impious statements? So the gap is filled up, and the arguments are marshalled, and the grand simplicity of the poem is almost hopelessly confused and concealed.

As to the rest of the poem, we have assumed a unity of authorship. It is true that many able critics would resolve it into a compilation of four or five distinct authors. It is also true that hardly any two of these critics agree in their analysis. No doubt persistent ingenuity can detect differences more or less marked between various parts of the poem, but—to take a modern instance—far less acuteness would suffice to prove that Goethe could never have written the whole of *Faust*. Of course the merest tyro in criticism can see that Part I. and Part II. are by different hands. But that is not all. Confining our attention to Part I., the signs of cleavage are at once apparent. What kind of critic must he be who could mistake the thin pipe of "The Marriage of Oberon and Titania" for the majestic diapason of Faust's soliloquy? Again, the scene in the witches' kitchen and the Walpurgis Night scene are obviously subsequent additions by a

¹ Chap. xxxvi. 26.

writer of marked individuality. Nay, the whole Gretchen episode appears on close investigation to be an addition cleverly grafted on the original work, but still clearly distinguishable from it. Thus our analysis of the poem would be something like this :—

1. Original Faust Poem and Dedication.
2. Gretchen Episode.
3. Witch scenes (Witches' kitchen and Walpurgis Night).
4. Marriage of Oberon and Titania.
5. Prelude on the stage.
6. Prologue in Heaven, possibly by author of 1.

Now, as a matter of fact, such an analysis would have much to justify it. There *is* an Old Faust legend, with which the story of Gretchen has nothing whatever to do. The witch scenes were not included in the original draft of the poem. The marriage of Oberon and Titania was not intended to form part of *Faust*, and was only incorporated with it by an after-thought. The prelude, prologue, and dedication are subsequent additions. And as to the two parts, the difference in style between them is confessedly immense. It is only when we consider the inner meaning and purpose of the poet, that we are able to trace a harmony binding the different parts together.

Such considerations should surely make us cautious when we have to deal with works that have come to us from a remote antiquity, and when we have nothing but the internal evidence to guide us. We are not, we hope, unmindful of the services philology has rendered, and is rendering, to literature, or wanting in respect to those eminent scholars who have made a special study of Semitic languages. But when we find these scholars deciding questions of authorship, not upon philological but upon literary grounds, then their decisions appear to us to lack that binding force they might otherwise justly claim, and the merely literary student may, without impertinence, challenge them. And, remembering how great may be the difference between work of the same man produced under different conditions, we think the presumption in the case of a work that comes before us with any appearance of homogeneity should be in favour of unity of authorship. In the case of the Book of Job, excepting the speech of Elihu, we think we can trace a unity of thought and purpose pointing to the presence of a single mind.

If the reading of the poem suggested in this article be correct, its interest must be permanent, and peculiarly adapted to an age like ours. For the author is not breaking his strength against the walls of impenetrably mystery, but is dealing with a question which arises in the experience of most thoughtful men and women. The contest between the letter and the spirit, the form and the substance, is perpetual, though at some epochs it attracts more attention than at others. That contest in its most heroic aspect is portrayed in the Book of Job. The besetting sin of the Jew was the tendency to formalism, yet it is

A New Reading of the Book of Job. 73

to Jewish literature we must turn for its sternest condemnation. The three champions of orthodoxy, as we should call them, so certain that they are speaking on behalf of God, so sure they do well to be angry with the audacious mocker whose impious words fill their zealous hearts with horror, and, on the other hand, the forsaken leper, whose afflictions seem so plainly to reflect the frown of Heaven. Every possible advantage appears to rest with the three. Their words are measured, their theological utterances are "sound." They walk in the good old paths their fathers trod before them. And yet,—who, even now, can read the climax without a quickening of the pulse? —it is the heretic who receives the crown of Divine approbation; it is he who must intercede on behalf of the self-satisfied three.

Job, then, is the Hebrew ideal of the truth-seeker—the type of the man who would gladly cling to the beliefs that have come down to him hallowed by memories and associations of the past, but who hears the awful voice which a man shall disregard at his direst peril, the imperious cry, "Arise and depart, for this is not your rest;" who rises up straightway, like Abraham of old, and, crossing deeper waters and wider plains than ever barred the patriarch's progress, enters at last into the goodly land, the land of promise.

INDEPENDENT SECTION.

[Under the above title a limited portion of THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW is occasionally set apart for the reception of able Articles, which, though harmonizing with the general spirit and aims of the Review, may contain opinions at variance with the particular ideas or measures it advocates. The object of the Editors in introducing this department is to facilitate the expression of opinion by writers of high mental power and culture, who, while they are zealous friends of freedom and progress, yet differ widely, on special points of great practical concern, both from the Editors and from each other.]

HUMANITARIANISM.

THE importance of *names*, not only as indicating the source of certain moral sentiments, but also as reacting in turn, according as they are well or ill constructed, on the minds of those who use them, has long been admitted. I am afraid the term "Humanitarianism" is not altogether a very happy or satisfactory compound. It is true that it begins auspiciously, by placing in its forefront so catholic and expressive a word as *humanity*; but having done this, it proceeds to disfigure its human aspect, like a centaur or a mermaid, by taking unto itself a series of formless and ungainly suffixes, until it finally "tails off" into that most unprepossessing of all terminations—an *-ism*. There is, moreover, an unfortunate ambiguity attaching to the words of this class, the high esteem in which the term *human* and its derivatives are held having led to attempts to appropriate them in one quarter or another. The connection between *human* and *humane* is, indeed, of deep and natural significance, humaneness being felt to be essentially a property of humankind; but here the scholar steps in, and, claiming for himself the title of *humanist*, would see in the "Humanities," as he calls them, nothing more than the study of polite literature; while the theologian, who must needs have a hand in every matter from the Creation downwards, would interpret "humanitarian" as one who denies the divinity of Christ. I wish, therefore, at the outset to avow that by humanitarianism I mean the study and practice of humane principles—of compassion, love, gentleness, and universal benevolence. If the word, in the sense in which I use it, is associated in the minds of any of my readers with "sickly sentimentality," I ask them to

divest themselves of all such prejudice until we have had time to look more closely into the principle in question.

The existence of this principle, by whatever name we may choose to call it, has not escaped the notice of philosophers, from Aristotle to the present time. Here is a concise definition given by Wollaston in his *Religion of Nature*, published in 1759. "There is something in *human* nature, resulting from our very make and constitution, which renders us obnoxious to the pains of others, causes us to sympathize with them, and almost comprehends us in their case. It is grievous to see or hear (and almost to hear of) any man, or even any animal-whatever, in torture." It will be seen that the definition I have adopted is based on an intuitive appeal to consciousness, rather than on the utilitarian view of morals, as a product of social life; there is, however, no need here to discuss the differences of the two schools of ethics, intuitive and utilitarian, on this point, since the principle itself is sufficiently recognized by both. Whether we follow Butler, in his assertion that compassion is "an original, distinct, particular, affection in human nature,"¹ or Hobbes, in his contrary contention, that it is "imagination, or fiction of future calamity to ourselves, proceeding from the sense of another man's calamity,"² the result is much the same to the modern humanitarian, who is convinced that, in this question, natural feelings and the promptings of an enlightened self-interest must work towards the same end, so that it practically matters little whether the original motive-power is to be attributed to benevolence or selfishness. "All that the intuitive moralist asserts," says Lecky, in his *History of European Morals*, "is that we know by nature that there is a distinction between humanity and cruelty, that the first belongs to the higher or better part of our nature, and that it is our duty to cultivate it."

But this view of humanity, as belonging to our higher nature, implies also the recognition of a lower nature, of which cruelty is a part. There appear to be two diverse and antagonistic impulses in the human mind, the one prompting to injury and destruction, the other to gentleness and love; while civilization itself is a record of the partial extinction of the baser element and the gradual development of the nobler. I would further premise that if humanity is to be regarded as a rational and consistent principle, to which civilized men may appeal with full confidence in its ultimate triumph and acceptance, it must rest on broad, firm grounds, and include, not men only, but all sentient beings, within the scope of its benevolence. "It is abundantly evident," says Lecky,³ "both from history and from present experience, that the instinctive shock, or natural feelings of disgust, caused by the sight of the sufferings of men, is not generically different from that which is caused by the sight of the

¹ Sermon on *Compassion*.

² *Human Nature*, ix. 10.

³ *History of European Morals*.

sufferings of animals." "At one time," says the same authority, "the benevolent affections embrace merely the family; soon the circle expanding includes—first a class, then a nation, then a coalition of nations, then all humanity; and finally its influence is felt in the dealings of man with the animal world." We see, therefore, that humanitarianism, in this large sense of far-reaching benevolence, means something more than "philanthropy," on the one hand, or "kindness to animals," on the other; yet, important as the question is acknowledged to be, it is unfortunately a fact, that, with a few notable exceptions, writers on morals have not shown an inclination to discuss it very thoroughly, or fully to face the conclusions which it seems to indicate; they have bequeathed to us tomes of learned disquisitions on various interesting speculations; while they have for the most part stood aloof from a subject which might afford a substantial basis for a practical system of morals. Here, however, it may be well, before entering on a consideration of modern humanitarianism, to glance backwards and take a brief historical retrospect of the progress of that principle to which the humanitarian appeals.

Passing over, as mythical, the legends of the Golden Age (which, however, at least show that the idea of gentleness and humanity was in existence in very early times), we find the first definite inculcation of love and compassion for all sentient beings in the doctrines of Buddha, some five hundred years before the Christian era. "He who is humane," says the Buddhist canon, "does not kill; this principle is imperishable." Buddha himself, in the legends that have collected round his name, is represented as both preaching and practising "love to all that live"; though the regenerating influences of this faith seem to have been somewhat deadened and restricted, in the later Buddhist church, by a despondent and pessimistic view of life and an excessive proneness to ritual observances. Almost contemporaneous with the rise of Buddhism in the East, and bearing a close resemblance to it in many of its doctrines, was the system established by Pythagoras in the West, which, though based on religious and social grounds rather than humanitarian, included among its ordinances the injunction "not to kill or injure any innocent animal," while the doctrine of metempsychosis, which was a vital point in the Pythagorean, as well as in the Buddhist philosophy, must have extended human sympathies by creating a link, not only between man and man, but between mankind and the rest of animated Nature. Whether the teaching of Pythagoras exercised much permanent influence on subsequent Greek thought, as regards this question of humaneness, appears doubtful; but the natural humanity of the Greek temperament, as compared with that of other nations of antiquity, has often been the subject of remark. The Greek felt an instinctive repugnance to cruelty, bloodshed, and tyranny—a feeling which finds expression in many passages of

Hellenic history and literature, and is illustrated by the significant fact that among the altars erected by the Athenians for the worship of various deities there was one sacred to Compassion. It is true that this gentleness was æsthetic rather than moral, and that many terrible instances of cruelty and oppression might be quoted to the contrary from the records of the Peloponnesian wars. "With all their intellect and all their subtlety," says a recent authority,¹ "the Greeks were wanting in heart. Their humanity was spasmodic, not constant. Their kindness was limited to friends and family, and included no chivalry to foes or to helpless slaves. Nevertheless, after the conquests of Alexander and the consequent spread of civilization, this Greek humanity became distinctly cosmopolitan; and it was probably to Greek influence that the Essenes—that strange Jewish sect whose history is still a matter of conjecture—owed somewhat of the singularly humane and benevolent spirit of their institutions. To the Essenes belongs the honour of having been the first who condemned, deliberately and on principle, the practice of slavery; they were themselves both communists and vegetarians; and, ascetics though they were, anticipated in an extraordinary degree some of the best features of modern humanitarianism. "They had in many respects," says a writer in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, "reached the very highest elevation attained by the ancient world; they were just, humane, benevolent, and spiritually minded."

The Romans were by nature far less humane than the Greeks, their policy as a conquering nation being to maintain, at whatever cost to their general character, a high standard of personal courage and hardihood, as exemplified in the typical instance of Cato the Censor, who, whatever his other virtues may have been, was assuredly not conspicuous for humanity. The two curses of the Roman Empire were the slave system and the gladiatorial games; the latter especially being the cause of a frightful amount of human and animal suffering, against which the impassive Stoic philosophy, which may be called the religion of the early Empire, was unwilling or powerless to protest. Yet, in spite of this plague-spot of the amphitheatre, and the demoralization resulting therefrom, the very immensity of the Roman dominions brought with it a sense of brotherhood and equality which took shape in humane thought and humane legislation, especially in reference to the position of slaves, even before the influence of Christianity was felt. Terence's famous line—

Homo sum; humani nihil a me alienum puto,

was the forerunner of many humane sentiments, concerning both mankind and the lower creation, which may be found scattered through the works of Lucretius, Cicero, Virgil, Ovid, and all the

¹ Prof. Mahaffy, in his *Social Greece*.

writers of the Augustan era. But it was reserved for two philosophers of the first century to preach, in Latin and Greek respectively, in a fuller and more consistent form, the doctrine of compassion. Seneca's ethical writings, and especially his essay on *Clemency*, are thoroughly steeped in humanitarian feeling; he condemns the harshness of masters to slaves, the inhuman treatment of criminals, the horrors of the Colosseum, and the cruel gluttony of the Roman table. Plutarch, developing still further the same line of reasoning, treated of the whole subject of man's relations to the lower animals with a tenderness and an insight far in advance of the ordinary thought of the present day. "He was probably," says Lecky, "the first writer who advocated very strongly humanity to animals on the broad grounds of universal benevolence, as distinguished from the Pythagorean doctrine of transmigration. . . . He urges that duty with an emphasis and a detail to which no adequate parallel can, I believe, be found in the Christian writings for at least seventeen hundred years."

This brings us to a consideration of the influence exercised by the Christian religion on the ethics of humanity. The failure of the Pagan philosophers in this, as in other branches of moral science, had been due to no lack of personal wisdom and virtue on their part, but rather to their inability to supply any direct motive and quickening impulse, which should make humaneness the property, not of the select few, but of the less cultured many. This impulse was now, to some extent, supplied by the rise of a religion, which, as regards mankind, was a gospel of love, peace, and good-will, though, as regards the lower animals, it was, as we shall see, far less liberal and consistent than the morality of Plutarch and Pythagoras. The sacredness of human life, which was one of the fundamental doctrines of the early Christians, was instrumental in leading to the abolition or mitigation of much human suffering; the Church, at any rate in its earlier stages, gave no sanction to the barbarities of warfare and capital punishment, while it strongly condemned the practice of infanticide, so common under the Roman Empire, and laboured to mitigate the condition of slaves and prisoners, by recognizing the natural equality of all human beings. The institution of hospitals in the West was due to Christian influence, and charity, though not unknown to the Pagan world, was now organized and practised as it had never been before, and on principles which might put to shame much of the bastard almsgiving of modern times. "Some of the Fathers," says Lecky, "proclaimed charity to be a matter, not of mercy, but of justice, maintaining that all property is based on usurpation, that the earth by right is common to all men, and that no man can claim a superabundant supply of its goods, except as an administrator for others"¹ Finally, the greatest and

¹ *History of European Morals*, ii. 86.

most unquestionable service rendered by the Christian Church to the cause of humanity, was the abolition of the gladiatorial contests in the Roman amphitheatre, with all their attendant horrors of brutality and bloodshed.

On the other hand, when we turn to the question of compassion for the lower animals, we find this aspect of morality less recognized in the New Testament than in the law of Moses, which contained at least some few regulations of a humane character. The idea of "redemption," and the consequent sacredness of human life, which had such salutary effects in improving the condition of mankind, was unfortunately the cause of a contrary tendency in the treatment of animals. "It should seem," says a modern writer,¹ "as if the primitive Christians, by laying so much stress upon a future life, in contradistinction to *this* life, and placing the lower creatures out of the pale of hope, placed them at the same time out of the pale of sympathy, and thus laid the foundation for this utter disregard of animals in the light of our fellow-creatures." It is to be feared that the foolish and mischievous notion of animals as "the beasts that perish," which even at this day is often pleaded as an excuse for cruelty, was indirectly an outcome of Christian doctrine; though I am here compelled in fairness to mention the story (told by Lecky) of a certain cardinal who used to allow vermin to bite him with impunity, consoling himself with the reflection that "*we* shall have heaven to reward us for our sufferings, but these poor creatures have nothing but the enjoyment of this present life." Unfortunately this humane inference from the dogma of human immortality, as contrasted with animal annihilation, is not the one that Christians have usually adopted in their treatment of "brute beasts." In short, while Christianity marked a great stride forward in the inculcation of humaneness to *men*, it was as distinctly a step backwards as regards the interests of animals.

Under the Churchdom of the Middle Ages, from the fifth to the fifteenth centuries, there was little progress in any sort of humaneness. The militant and tyrannical spirit of established Christianity, with its theological dogmatizing, its "holy" wars, its cruel persecutions, its religious intolerance, and monstrous fiction of an eternal hell of torments hereafter, was a grievous deterioration from the benign gentleness of its Founder; while the mysticism and asceticism of mediæval thought contrasted unfavourably with the humane philosophy of such men as Seneca and Plutarch. The Catholic Church has at no period made adequate recognition of the rights of animals—the hermit-legends being all that it can claim in this direction during the Middle Ages; and even the influence of the hermits over the animals they tamed was used to point a religious rather than a humane moral. St. Francis of Assisi was, however, a

¹ Mrs. Jamson, *Book of Thoughts, Memories, and Fancies* (1854.)

noble exception in this respect, his deep sympathy and sense of brotherhood with beast and bird standing out in strong contrast to that prevailing tone of cruelty and indifference which has caused Buddhists to speak of Christendom as the "hell of animals." The best that we can say of these "dark ages," on the score of humanity, is that the monasteries, like the old heathen temples, afforded a refuge to the outcast; that the establishment of hospitals and charitable institutions was further proceeded with; and that the cessation of the gladiatorial contests was followed, in the seventh century, by the prohibition of the slaughter of animals in the arena—the Spanish bull-fights, however, surviving to modern times as an ugly relic of mediæval barbarity.

When the curtain rises, after this interval of a thousand years, on the drama of moral progress, we see at first a "revival of learning" in literature and science rather than in humane feeling; it is to the humanist rather than to the humanitarian that the Renaissance belongs. The age was a rough and cruel one, full of wars and plunderings, tortures and persecutions, inhumanity to man and beast, oppressive forest laws, and savage pastimes; it was, moreover, at this period that the system of negro-slavery began to come into existence; while in Descartes' theory, that animals are devoid of consciousness, was found a fresh excuse for their remorseless ill-usage. Nevertheless—since there is really a vital connection between humanity and humanism—there are many traces in the Renaissance literature of a reviving advocacy of the principle of compassion; More and Erasmus condemn the folly and cruelty of sport; humane sentiments are common in the writings of Shakespeare and Bacon; the essays of Montaigne, in particular, breathe almost the spirit of eighteenth century humanitarianism. For not until the eighteenth century can we discover a deliberate and systematic recognition of humanitarian ethics; the eighteenth century was the age of "sensibility;" of the claims of man on man; of growing pity for the victims of wars, pestilence, famine, and oppression; of a humaner and gentler tone in every branch of life. This tone is predominant in the works of a long list of poets of this epoch: Thomson, Gay, Pope, Goldsmith, Shenstone, Blake, Burns, and Cowper. Nor were the philosophers behindhand, Voltaire especially, as the chief exponent of the new gospel, declaring that "without humanity, that virtue which comprehends all virtues, the name of philosopher would be little deserved."¹

The agitation to abolish the slave-trade, commencing in the latter half of the eighteenth century and attaining its purpose in 1807, was one of a large number of similar philanthropic movements, which, from that time to this, have done much to humanize modern life, and to mitigate the harshness of various social institutions where

¹ Quoted in Mr. Howard Williams' *Ethics of Diet* (1883), a work to which I am indebted for many of the facts above quoted.

cruelty had previously existed unchecked and almost unnoticed. From the date when Beccaria published his work *On Crimes and Punishments* in 1764, and Howard, a few years later, made his first inspection of prisons, public attention was attracted to the inhumanities of the Penal Code, with its frequent sentences of capital punishment or transportation for comparatively venial crimes; and it began to be recognized that the legislator's object should be, not the degradation, but the *reclamation*, of the criminal. Lunacy also, which before the eighteenth century had been regarded as a species of diabolic possession or malice prepense on the part of the lunatic, now for the first time excited the pity of the spectator; and madmen, instead of being burnt for witchcraft or chained and tortured like wild-beasts, were treated as suffering fellow-beings. The Factory Acts, again, are another and later example of the working of the same humane spirit; while the Poor Laws (though their present administration is too much in the interests of the wealthy classes, and forms an exception to the general humanitarianism of the age) were at least humane in their origin. Nor have the benefits of this great humanitarian movement of the last one hundred and fifty years been restricted to mankind alone. Bentham, one of the most earnest advocates of animals' rights, asserted boldly that the question is "not Can they *reason*? nor Can they *speak*? but Can they *suffer*?" And in 1882 the English Parliament, by the passing of "Martin's Act," inaugurated a new and important chapter in the history of humanity, by conceding the principle that the non-human races have a claim to legislative protection—a precedent which has since been emphasized by a series of similar enactments.

To enumerate the humane writers of a period where all are more or less tinged with humanitarian sentiment, is neither desirable nor possible; it must be stated, however, that in the writings of Schopenhauer humanitarianism has attained its fullest and most philosophical development. In his *Foundation of Morality* he takes as his moral basis "a compassion without limits, which unites us with all living beings;" in this, he adds, "we have the most solid, the surest guarantee of morality." On this underlying sentiment of Compassion he grounds the two cardinal virtues of Justice and Love—the former a negative, the latter an active, principle; the one restraining us from doing injury and wrong, the other prompting us to help, succour, and relieve. Whether Schopenhauer be correct in the exact position he assigns to Justice and Love in their relation to Compassion, is open to question; but it seems certain that the sense of compassion and the sense of justice are in some measure akin; the pity which the humanitarian feels for suffering is usually evoked by, or connected with, the belief that this suffering is undeserved—in other words, it is a protest against the injustice of Nature or man. The humanitarian movement is thus founded on natural

sympathy, and this being so, it will be advanced, and not retarded, by the doctrine of evolution, which tends to restore, on a scientific basis, the old Pythagorean notion of the unity of man with Nature, and the sense of universal fellowship and brotherhood. "The doctrine of metempsychosis," says Strauss,¹ "knits men and beasts together there [in the East], and unites the whole of Nature in one sacred and mysterious bond. It is remarkable that at present a deeper sympathy with the animal world should have arisen among the more civilized nations, which manifests itself here and there in societies for the prevention of cruelty to animals. It is thus apparent that what on the one hand is the product of modern science—the giving up of the spiritualistic isolation of man from Nature—reveals itself simultaneously through the channel of popular sentiment."

Such being the course of humane progress in the past, let us now consider what is the present position of humanitarianism, its purpose, and its scope. It is founded, if I understand it rightly, on the instinct of compassion, an instinct which, if not original in our nature, is an acquisition of such an early date as to be practically original—while closely allied with this compassion is the kindred sense of justice. The object of humanitarianism is to prevent the perpetration of cruelty and wrong—to redress the sufferings, as far as is possible, of all sentient life; to effect which, it must attempt to educate and organize this innate instinct into a definite and rational principle. I say as far as is possible; for I do not, of course, deny that compassion, when it assumes a practical form, must experience, for a time at any rate, its restrictions and limitations. We cannot always give effect to our compassionate promptings, since in some cases they may be curtailed or negatived by the other and still more powerful motive of self-preservation, or by a rival and countervailing impulse of compassion itself. But such limitation, so far from rendering the duty of humaneness nugatory and void, seems, on the contrary, to emphasize its urgency and importance in all cases where there is no obstacle that is confessedly insurmountable.

There can be no doubt, whatever, as to the immense amount of present suffering which claims the attention of the humanitarian. Indeed, one is inclined to believe that as the virtue of compassion becomes more conscious, rational, and pronounced, so too does the corresponding vice of cruelty or indifference become more malignant and incorrigible, retreating stubbornly as it is driven back, point by point, from argument to argument, and ever ready to fortify itself anew in some remaining stronghold of intellectual sophistry. The demon of misery, like the Proteus of Greek legend, takes new forms as we strive to bind him with the bonds of reason and humanity; the curse of one age is physical violence—exorcise it, and it rises up

¹ *The Old Faith and the New*, p. 234, translated by Mathilde Blind.

again in the shape of plutocratic ascendancy. Human life, which is now so carefully safeguarded against pillage and slaughter, is ever being slowly undermined by the insidious ravages of poverty, which at the present time is probably the cause of tenfold more human misery than any other plague whatsoever; we are aghast at the notion of open bloodshed, but meantime starvation is doing its fatal work in our great cities, more quietly perhaps, but with none the less deadly effect. So, too, with the sufferings of animals; we have left far behind us the cruelties of the old religious sacrifice, the Roman amphitheatre, and the medicinal nostrum; but we tolerate, or even applaud, the professions of the butcher, the sportsman, and the vivisector; the rage for "killing something" is one of the most popular fashions of modern times—"everywhere," says a writer in *Blackwood*, "it is absolutely a capital crime to be an unowned creature."

Against these and other forms of human and animal suffering the humanitarian protests, appealing to that common instinct of humanity and justice which he assumes, and rightly assumes, to be inherent, however imperfectly developed, in every human heart. And if the appeal is too often made in vain, the cause of such failure is to be sought in the lack of any well-defined and unmistakable standard of humaneness, which might form the basis of a mutual understanding, since, in so complex a society, more is needed than the mere appeal to the original instinct of compassion. And here it is that infinite mischief is done by the too common confusion between sentiment and sentimentality. Much of our so-called "charity" and "philanthropy" is purely sentimental, succeeding only in diverting interest and enthusiasm from those enterprises in which some thoroughly humane purpose is at stake. "As for doing good," says Thoreau, "that is one of the professions which are full. There are a thousand hacking at the branches of evil to one who is striking at the root, and it may be that he who bestows the largest amount of time and money on the needy is doing the most by his mode of life to produce that misery which he strives in vain to relieve. It is the pious slave-dealer devoting the proceeds of every tenth slave to buy a Sunday's liberty for the rest." It is only by the adoption of some broad and rational principle that the energy at present absorbed into this partial and short-sighted philanthropy can be reclaimed and turned to good account in the service of humanitarianism; and the same remedy is indispensable if we are ever to overcome the cruelty, or let us rather call it indifference, with which the well-to-do classes too often reject the appeals that are made to them on behalf of the victims of social injustice. For, putting out of consideration the active vindictiveness which may be engendered from anger or malice, cruelty, in nine cases out of ten, is due to a want of sensibility and sympathy—in other words, of imagination; the cruel man is cruel

because he cannot put himself in the place of those who suffer, cannot feel with them, and imagine the misfortunes from which he is himself exempt. The cure for cruelty is therefore to induce men to cultivate a sympathetic imagination; but the difficulty of effecting this is enormously increased by the fact that the duty of humanity, as at present preached and understood, is so very vague, partial, and intermittent. As long as certain favoured aspects of humaneness are exclusively insisted on, as long as pity is felt and expressed for this or that particular form of human suffering, while others of equal or greater importance are neglected or ridiculed; and, above all, as long as the compassion which is claimed for men is denied to animals—so long will it be difficult to appeal successfully from the narrow selfishness of personal interests to the higher and nobler sentiment of universal brotherhood.

If I dwell longer on the subject of humanity to animals than may seem to be warranted by its intrinsic importance, it is only because it is the point which is most likely, through prejudice or thoughtlessness, to be slighted and overlooked, and therefore the best criterion of a sure and thorough-going humaneness. The rights of animals are now recognized in England; but though humane treatment is expressly advocated in theory, its practice is still of a very partial and uncertain character, and is vitiated by the every-day recurrence of deeds which, though they pass unchallenged in our midst, are quite incompatible with the existence of a truly humane society. Here, too, as in the case of human suffering, but in a still more aggravated form, we find sentimentality, on the one side, and, on the other, indifference; while the essential principle is often altogether overlooked. The controversy has of late years been waged chiefly over the question of vivisection—a narrowing of the issues which seems to have exercised a most melancholy and debilitating effect on the logical and intellectual acumen of the combatants on both sides, the literature of the subject being little better than a farrago of *tu quoques* and similar argumentative ineptitudes. It is all very well for humane sportsmen to inveigh pathetically against the iniquities of vivisection, and there is undoubtedly a certain satisfaction in pointing out that when Sir Charles Bell tortured monkeys, in order to find a cure for squinting, he was forgetful of the obliquity of his own moral vision; or in hinting that, instead of cutting the facial nerves of donkeys, he would have acted more appropriately had he experimented on his own. But, unfortunately, such partial indictments are apt to provoke equally partial rejoinders; and accordingly we find the humane vivisectors turning the tables on the humane sportsmen by exhibiting sport as “the love of the clever destruction of beautiful things,”¹ and by calculating that the number of wild creatures yearly mangled by English sportsmen, and left to

¹ Prof. Jevons, in *Fortnightly Review*, 1876.

perish as they may, in addition to those slain outright, is about three millions. What is the meaning of this personal and pettifogging method of approaching, or rather of *not* approaching, a subject which imperatively needs to be treated with thoroughness and candour? Simply that the "lovers of animals" being, like the "philanthropists," largely of the sentimental class have no inclination to look this question of humanitarianism fairly in the face; they will not investigate the main principle which militates against *all* forms of cruelty, because, consciously or unconsciously, they feel that this would confront them with no less prevalent a habit than that of flesh-eating, which every year inflicts on the lower animals more suffering than what the sportsman and vivisector cause in a century. The institution of the slaughter-house is the skeleton-in-the-cupboard of pseudo-humanitarianism, taking the heart out of its enthusiasm and the force out of its reasoning: while this is tolerated, the study of compassion must necessarily be nerveless and inconsequent, its practice weak, crippled, and incomplete. The significant manner in which humane writers, such as Bentham, Benjamin Franklin, Paley,¹ Schopenhauer, and Miss Frances Power Cobbe,² while condemning unreservedly all *other* forms of cruelty, think it necessary to advance all sorts of contradictory justifications of this particular practice, is a proof that they have been haunted by a latent sense of the incongruity of their position. "The whole subject of the brute creation," said Dr. Arnold, "is to me one of such painful mystery that I dare not approach it." What wonder that sensitive moralists should feel this difficulty?—since, *if* Nature has imposed on us the lasting necessity of supporting our own lives by the deaths of countless numbers of harmless creatures, it must be confessed that the instinct of humanity has been implanted and developed in us only to find itself mocked and frustrated in the end by an inhuman and inexorable fatality. It is no part of my present purpose to advocate the *practice* of vegetarianism; but this much must be said, that the question of flesh-eating cannot possibly be evaded by any one who wishes to take a consistent and comprehensive view of humanitarian ethics.

That a lack of humanity in any particular direction tends ultimately to produce an indifference to humanity in general, is, I think, indisputable. I do not mean, of course, to assert that all individuals who are cruel in one instance are thereby, to any perceptible degree, incapacitated from being humane in others; on the contrary, it has been part of my object to show that the inconsistency of men in this respect is a real and honest inconsistency, and for that very reason the more difficult to cope with; the human mind possessing an extraordinary faculty for seeing one fact very plainly, while it overlooks

¹ *Moral and Political Philosophy*, i. 2.

² "Rights of Men and Claims of Brutes," *Fraser*, 1863.

others that are equally within its scope. Hogarth, in his "Four Stages of Cruelty," depicts his villain, Tom Nero, first as a boy torturing a dog; then as a coachman ill-using his horse; then as the murderer of his sweetheart; and, finally, as the corpse of a hanged criminal undergoing surgical dissection. This is certainly a very remarkable and appalling chain of events; but I doubt if the Tom Neros of real life could ever be greatly impressed by it, for it savours too much of that inventive school of morality which, in defiance of real facts, inculcates the pious theory that Don't-care comes to a bad end. There is far more truth in Lecky's statement that human affections are so capricious that the same man may be both kind and cruel without conscious self-contradiction. He instances Spinoza, who, being one of the gentlest of men, used nevertheless to amuse himself by putting flies into spiders'-webs; and Marat, who, though of a contrary disposition, used to keep doves. A "humane sportsman" is, properly speaking, a contradiction in terms; and when Izaak Walton remarks, "I am not of a cruel nature; I love to kill nothing but fish," one is reminded of Byron's utterance concerning a certain "old cruel coxcomb." Yet, in a narrower sense, gentleness and ungentleness (such is the inconsistency of human nature) are often observed to be alternate inmates of the same mind; humane torture there cannot be, but the torturer may, at other times, and under other aspects, be humane. "There are unquestionably," says Leigh Hunt,¹ "many amiable men among sportsmen, who, as the phrase is, would not 'hurt a fly'—that is to say, on a window; at the end of a string the case is altered." But while admitting the existence of this duality of temperament in individual cases, I cannot doubt that familiarity with the sight of suffering, whatever that suffering may be, must insensibly, in the long run, affect and weaken the operation of the compassionate instinct, and that humaneness, as a general principle, must suffer from being confined to certain favoured objects. "The legislator," says Bentham,² "ought to interdict everything which may serve to lead to cruelty. The barbarous spectacles of gladiators without doubt contributed to give the Romans that ferocity which they displayed in their civil wars. A people accustomed to despise human life in their games could not be expected to respect it amid the fury of their passions. It is proper, for the same reason, to forbid every kind of cruelty towards animals, whether by way of amusement or to gratify gluttony. . . . Why should the law refuse its protection to any sensitive being? The time will come when humanity will extend its mantle over everything which breathes. We have begun by attending to the condition of slaves; we shall finish by softening that of all the animals which assist our labours or supply our wants."

¹ *Table Talk.*

² *Principles of Penal Law*, chap. xvi.

The moral of the whole matter appears to be that, if we are to study humanitarianism with profit either to ourselves or to the objects of our benevolence, we must study it rationally, as a definite branch of moral science, and not as a dilettante, fair-weather amusement, to be taken up here, and let alone there, according as may suit our passing whims and inclinations. A short time ago there was an account in the newspapers of a pathetic sermon addressed by a London clergyman to a fashionable West-end audience, concerning the sufferings of cab-horses, and "many were the tears," said the reporter, "that were shed on the sumptuous sealskins of that deeply affected congregation." Here was exactly the sort of spasmodic sentimentality to which I have made allusion—a cheap compassion for the ill-used cab-horse, side by side with complete forgetfulness of the equally ill-used sea-cow. The hunting of the seal, it is well-known, involves such brutalities that even the roughest sailors and fishermen need first to become hardened to the work; ladies, however, like to wear sealskin mantles, on which they shed tears of compassion—not for the evil condition of animals in general, nor even for the sea-cow in particular, but at the picture drawn by a popular preacher of that system of vehicular traffic into which (when the tears are dried) they will doubtless continue to sell their own superannuated chargers. Can we wonder, all things considered, that, in spite of the outcry raised about "slaughtered songsters," women still persist in wearing feathered corpses, and fragments of corpses, in their hats and bonnets? And who shall blame them for doing so, unless he is able to refer them to some unmistakable standard of humanity under which such hideous ornamentation would be impossible? There are a number of futile cries that are raised at times on these matters, as, for instance, the desperate appeal to the tender mercies of women. "I think women could do a great deal in this question," says Sir Arthur Helps, in his *Animals and their Masters*. What can women do, where men fail? and how can either men or women do much, unless they know their own minds and have thought the matter out with some approach to consistency? So, too, with the equally impotent plea for mercy to the lower animals because they are "dumb." "What an immense exhortation," says Sir Arthur Helps, "that is to pity." But in reality it is men who are *deaf*, rather than animals who are *dumb*, and it is to be feared that epithets and names of this sort, so far from being an incentive to kindness, have a precisely contrary effect. Richard Jefferies has characteristically denounced the term *pauper* as an "inexpressibly wicked word;" and in like manner there is a sinister influence in the nomenclature which has invented such phrases as "brute beasts," "live-stock," and "dumb animals." There is a story told in Leigh Hunt's *Imaginary Conversations of Pope and Swift*, which illustrates this point. "The Dean once asked a scrub who was fishing, if he

had ever caught the fish called the Scream. The man protested that he had never heard of such a fish. 'What!' says the Dean, 'you an angler, and never heard of the fish that gives a shriek when coming out of the water? 'Tis the only fish that has a voice, and a sad dismal sound it is.' The man asked who could be so barbarous as to angle for a creature that shrieked. 'That,' said the Dean, 'is another matter; but what do you think of fellows that I have seen, whose only reason for hooking and tearing all the fish they can get at, is that they do *not* scream?'"

In thus pointing out how a partial and one-sided humanitarianism may retard the progress of a rational philosophy of compassion, I do not, of course, forget that many noble deeds have been done, and are still being done, in the service of humanity by men who have singled out some particular form of cruelty for exposure and reprobation. Whatever short-sightedness may at times be detected in philanthropic endeavour, there is a far greater inconsistency in the attitude of most so-called "men of the world," who, while practically admitting the validity of the instinct of compassion (for there are very few who do not in some way practise or appeal to it), not only refrain from cultivating it in their own characters, but are often ready to ridicule and withstand the humanitarianism of others. If compassion be not in reality a virtue, or do not possess the importance attributed to it by philosophers and moralists, then by all means let the fact be avowed by those who hold this opinion, and let them frame a programme for the future guidance of society in which pity shall have no part. But if we still believe in the efficacy of sympathy, love, and the link of universal brotherhood, then I submit that this compassionate instinct demands from us a more systematic study than it has hitherto received; it deserves better than to be rejected with cold indifference or advocated with ill-balanced enthusiasm. Why should we drift on without a guiding principle—saving life with one hand, only to take it with the other; asserting the sacredness of human existence, while we know that fellow-creatures all around us are worse than dying under the death-in-life of penury and distress; sentimentalizing, when we walk abroad, about our love for the beasts and birds in meadow and woodland, and then returning home to display our still stronger liking for them, as they appear on our dinner-tables in their other and more familiar aspect? Instead of fostering that dull insensibility which is closely allied to cruelty, we must cultivate the higher and more imaginative moral instincts, so that the immense power of *habit*, which has hitherto been uniformly opposed to humaneness, may now be enlisted in its behalf. But the humaneness which we advocate must, if not wholly consistent, be at least consistent enough to harmonize with our compassionate instincts, so far as they are yet developed.

I make this limitation, because it must be conceded that in humani-

tarianism, as in other branches of ethics, absolute consistency is impossible. Morality being progressive, there is no given point in our moral development where we can hold a perfectly logical and unassailable position ; there are always indications of a further forward movement and an expansion of the whole moral horizon ; so that it may be prognosticated that our sympathies, as they advance, will embrace a wider and ever widening circle, and there will never be a final and positive standard of humanitarian ethics. For this reason, humanitarians need not be greatly concerned, if in advocating the further extension of the scope of benevolence they lay themselves open to the time-honoured argument which the ancients called *sorites*, and which nowadays usually begins with the formula, "Where will you draw the line?" Let the line be drawn—if where all is shifting and progressive there can be said to be a line at all—at the point indicated by human compassion, provided always that this compassion has been allowed free growth, and has not been artificially stunted and crippled by prejudice and habit. It must be granted that there are certain complex and difficult questions (as, for instance, the right of civilized nations to interfere with savage tribes, or the right of mankind to enslave the lower animals), the full solution of which must be left to some future generation, the time being not yet ripe for the moralization of subjects which at present do not evoke any definite moral feeling. But because the whole journey cannot be accomplished at one stride, it does not follow that *no* step should be taken ; the humanitarian should attack the *worst* abuses first, and decline to be led astray from the path of reform by the reproach that he has not attained to an absolute and impossible consistency. But that other incongruity, of attacking minor abuses, while he leaves the grosser ones unchallenged, he cannot afford to overlook ; for if he do so he cuts the ground from under his own feet, and retards the very movement of which he desires the advancement. These gradations of humanity, which, if not logical, are at least natural and unavoidable, are indicated, as I have already said, by the instinct of compassion, which is excited in proportion, not only to the amount of the suffering, but also to the nearness and, above all, the *sensibility* of the sufferer. The more keenly the agony is felt, the greater is the duty of the humanitarian to relieve it.

At the same time I venture to surmise (at the risk of being thought too fanciful) that the scope of humane feeling will gradually be expanded until it includes much that is at present held to be outside the pale of sympathy. "There is a certain respect, and a general duty of humanity," says Montaigne, "that ties us not only to beasts that have life and sense, but even to trees and plants." This suggests the further reflection, that humaneness bears a close affinity to the love of beauty, there being a natural connection between the horror with which we witness human or animal torture

and the disgust excited by the wanton desecration of any beautiful scene—the destruction of a growing tree, or the pollution of a clear river. There could scarcely be a better profession of the humanitarian faith than that contained in one of the rules of Ruskin's "Society of St. George." "I will not kill nor hurt any living creature needlessly, nor destroy any beautiful thing ; but will strive to save and comfort all gentle life, and guard and perfect all natural beauty upon the earth." Which is to prevail—the humane instinct which has been developed, step by step, into this doctrine of humanitarianism, or the savage instinct, a relic of prehistoric barbarity, which prompts us to a cruel self-aggrandizement, without regard to the sufferings of others ? It is no exaggeration to say that the answer which history shall give to this question, will largely determine the future course of civilized society.

The present age is confessedly one of transition, in religious and moral belief ; the old faiths are dying or dead, and we look for some new motive-power to take their place in the future. This coming creed, which shall interpret and reconcile the Babel of conflicting utterances by which we are now bewildered, seems likely to be none other than a religion of humanity—humanity in no narrower sense than compassion, love, justice, for every living creature ; for in proportion as such gentleness is more and more inculcated and practised shall we be drawing nearer and nearer to a true civilization, a society in which all harmless and healthy life shall be free to develop itself unrestricted and uninjured. There can be little doubt that, with the spread of Socialism, we shall witness a simultaneous spread of humanitarian feeling, since the very essence of Socialism is equality and brotherhood, and a solidarity of sympathies must bring with it a relaxation of many cruel practices which owe their continued existence solely to the present estrangement of class from class. Not only does Socialism strike at the roots of poverty—that most fruitful source of human wretchedness—but with the disappearance of the pitiless system of competition and self-seeking there will disappear also the need of enforcing a harsh Penal Code in the interests of the wealthy classes ; while the primary cause of a large proportion of the wars, crimes, and vices that disfigure the world will be gradually eradicated. A better treatment of the domestic animals will also become possible when we are no longer compelled to employ them mainly with a view to pecuniary profit. As regards the relation of mankind towards the lower animals in general, it is to be hoped that the society of the future will not repeat the error of the Christian Church in the past, by restricting its sympathies too exclusively to *human* interests and *human* welfare, but will remember that the true humanitarianism can rest satisfied with nothing less than the emancipation of *all* sentient beings from the bonds of suffering. It has been the object of this paper to show that there is a natural

and necessary correlation between the various manifestations of humane sentiment, and that if one be recognized it is unreasonable to refuse acceptance to the rest.

What has been said of humanitarianism as a saving and guiding faith is no mere supposition. Great changes cannot be effected in a day, and the existence and strength of the contrary tendency to that which I have advocated, must be admitted and reckoned with. But in *Compassion*, whether we regard it as a primary instinct or an acquired faculty, there is a solid and incontrovertible basis, on which may be founded, and indeed *has* been founded, an ethical creed, which has the advantage of being at once popular and philosophical, appealing unmistakably to the sympathy and the intellect of the wisest and the simplest of mankind. Humanitarianism has done much in the past to alleviate misery and suffering, in spite of the many obstacles by which its progress has been retarded: it will do still more in the future if its leading principle, once deliberately adopted, be followed out, rationally and fearlessly, to its just and inevitable conclusion.

H. S. SALT.

LORD DUFFERIN AND THE INDIAN CONGRESS.

THE Congress literature has by this time grown so enormous that any additional contribution to it, unless it have a peculiar merit, cannot be looked upon as a gain. The public utterances, however, of a retiring Viceroy who has presided over the destinies of the vast Indian Empire with such marked success, and administered the country he has just left with such admirable results, and who, moreover, enjoys an unique European reputation, cannot fail to awaken interest both in India and England.

Lord Dufferin approaches the question of the national movement in India with the spirit of a fair critic, who is solicitous to deal justly with it, but who, at the same time, cannot ignore facts and overlook the complicated machinery of the Government in India. He approaches the subject in no antagonistic spirit, and the sympathy with which he treated it in the memorable St. Andrew's Day speech renders it the more welcome. In fact, one is struck with the conciliatory tone of the address. The late Viceroy does not seem to be opposed to a gradual and progressive development of the government, and with it the admission of Indians to a greater share in the administration of their country. We have indications of this throughout, and it is worth while to quote such portions as have a bearing on this point. Lord Dufferin says: "As soon as the circumstances of the case permitted, successive statesmen, both at home and in India itself, employed themselves from time to time in softening the severity of the system under which our dominion was established. and strenuous efforts were repeatedly made, not only to extend to Her Majesty's subjects in India the same civil rights and privileges which are enjoyed by Her Majesty's subjects at home, but to admit them as far as was possible to a share in the management of their own affairs. The proof of this is plainly written in our recent history. It is seen in our legal codes which secured to all Her Majesty's subjects, without distinction of race, or creed, or class, equality before the law. It is found in the establishment of local legislative councils—a quarter of a century ago—wherein a certain number of leading natives were associated with the Government in enacting measures suitable to local wants. It lies at the basis of

the great principle of decentralized finance which has prepared the way for the establishment of increased local responsibility. It received a most important development in the municipal legislation of Lord Northbrook's administration. It took a still fuller and more perfect expression, during the administration of my distinguished predecessor, in the Municipal and Local Boards Acts; and it has acquired a further illustration in the recommendations of the Public Service Commission recently sent home by the Government of India, in accordance with which more than a hundred offices hitherto reserved to the covenanted service would be thrown open to the provincial service, and thus placed within the reach of our native fellow-subjects in India."

Again, later on, while commenting on the misapprehension of the Congress party as to the proper direction in which their energies should be employed, he says: "I do not at all wish to imply that I view with anything but favour and sympathy the desire of the educated classes of India to be more largely associated with us in the conduct of the affairs of their country. Such an ambition is not only very natural, but very worthy, provided due regard be had to the circumstances of the country, and to the conditions under which the British administration in India discharges its duties."

The sentiments embodied in the above passages ought to set aside any doubt that exists as to the sincerity of Lord Dufferin's goodwill towards India, and point to the gradual extension of power to Indians in the government of their own country. Of course it was becoming in a sagacious ruler like the late Viceroy, whose utterances are statesmanlike, to countenance the evolution of government somewhat on the principle of the survival of the fittest. But his sagacity would naturally object to "a very big jump into the unknown"—by the application to India of democratic methods of Government and the adoption of a parliamentary system, which England herself has only reached by slow degrees, and through the discipline of many centuries of preparation.

To such a step, I need not say, the teachings of history are quite opposed. In no country democratic government was established all at once, and hence in India, where political institutions based upon popular sentiments have been quite unknown, where despotism, prior to the establishment of British supremacy, has been the chief form of government, and where a conflict between a people, trying on one hand to secure constitutional rights and privileges, and an arbitrary power withholding them on the other, is unknown, democracy is not likely to take root at all.

The discussion of the democratic principles of government brings us to the consideration of the objections that have been raised by Lord Dufferin against the Congress movement. As they pertain to some of the questions that form the central ideas of the move-

ment, they require very careful treatment. Speaking broadly, then, Lord Dufferin's objections are based first upon the obligations and responsibilities of the Government of India, which have a bearing upon the distinct nationalities of the Indian "Cosmos," the imperial and foreign interests of the country, the supervision of the native States, which number 117, and wield much power for the weal or woe of fifty millions of human beings committed to their care. To these must be added certain pledges, implied or expressed, which, furnishing as they do; the assumption that "English rule and English justice will remain dominant in India," have induced people to engage in commercial and other similar enterprises, and to sink large funds in Indian railways, and so forth. In face of these obligations, responsibilities, trusts, and pledges, Lord Dufferin does not see how he could hand over the government of the country to the educated classes who form the "microscopic minority," who have no representative character, and whose proportion to the masses is very insignificant—almost a drop in the ocean. When we reflect calmly over the arguments adduced by the late Viceroy in support of his proposition on this subject, we are forced to admit the truth of his assertions. We admit that India has made great progress in education, and the growth of an intelligent public opinion, and that the number of men of Western culture and Western thought is increasing rapidly. But we do not think that they have as yet, a representative character, for representation implies a politically trained people in the background. While primary education is still struggling to obtain a footing amongst the people, we cannot have such a class. Political unity of the people, too, which is so very necessary for combined action and organization, cannot be effected, as there are hundreds of obstacles to it, such as the situation and physical features of the country, its peculiarly constituted societies, its different religions and customs and manners, and its caste distinctions. There is yet another element, as Lord Dufferin says, which must be considered in the discussion of a question of this sort. The Mahomedan community, with its distinctive characteristics, whether religious, social, or ethnological, which has shown no sympathy for the movement, is a great drawback to political unity. Therefore, under the present circumstances, to talk, as the speakers at this Congress have done, about national unity for India, is as unreasonable as it would be to discuss the unity of the Latin races as a problem within the range of practical politics. Such being the case, and the educated spokesmen of the people being self-elected and devoid of all true representative character, it is absurd to clamour for a constitution analogous to that we enjoy in England: all the elements which produced it are wanting in India. The objections of Lord Dufferin, in the second place, refer to the misconception of the Congress party as to proper

direction in which their energies should be employed. The remarks of the late Viceroy on this point are pertinent. It cannot be doubted for a moment that the things that should claim our attention first should be those which affect us the most; and certainly our foremost thoughts should be about the sanitary state of our towns in which we live, breathe, and move about; the introduction of social reforms, which is so very necessary for the accomplishment of the object the Congress has in view; and the diffusion of education amongst the masses, which is one of the essentials of representation.

The third objection of Lord Dufferin relates to what may be called the new manifestation of the movement. One of the methods lately employed by the Congressionists has been to issue two pamphlets, in the form of catechisms, with the third report of the Congress meeting held at Madras. The object of these indiscreet publications—not to use a stronger term—is to hold up the Government of India to the contempt and indignation of the people as “unjust, inconsiderate, ill-informed, and reckless of the consequences of their actions.” Now we all know how much inflammable material there is in India, and we can easily conceive what evils will ensue if such pamphlets are circulated amongst the credulous and ignorant masses.

Such means of propaganda are a discredit to any cause, and place us in an ugly light before the civilized world, where we are striving hard to take up a position. They are not unlikely to convince Europeans that, in the heat of controversy and passion, we have forgotten the many blessings which British rule in India has brought: these are peace, equal laws, an improved education, and the comforts and conveniences of modern life. On the comparative liberty of action and thought, and entire religious liberty, I will not here dwell. They are patent to everybody. All that I wish to say is that we should remember that it is England which has made us what we are, and hence we should not forget our obligations to that country.

The measures of the Congress do not seem to be so objectionable as their methods, for their chief resolution refers to a point about which the opinion is gaining ground, that the provincial councils, as well as the Council of the Governor-General, should be placed on a broader basis of representation. The necessity of this is becoming clearer every day, and perhaps the time is not distant when the Government will introduce the needful reforms. It is not necessary, perhaps, in the course of the present paper, to formulate a scheme as to this, though it may be suggested that the best plan would be to ask municipal corporations, which are for the most part by this time elected bodies, to nominate members for the provincial councils, and when they have been thus constructed, it will be a comparatively easy task to organize the Supreme Council by delegat-

ing a member from each provincial council who shall have received his training in that council. The resolution pertaining to the separation of judicial and executive offices seems to be theoretically correct. But as the change would involve a large expenditure of money, it will be almost impossible to deal with it until the fiscal state of India has improved; and surely, when the combined judicial and executive machinery has worked satisfactorily hitherto, we can afford to wait till better times. Rome was not built in a day.

The resolution about the repeal of the Arms Act, and about granting a wholesale volunteering system to India, do not seem to be dictated by a sense of the necessity and policy of these measures, and, hence, are not likely to receive much consideration at the hands of the Government. In India, where ample provisions have already been made for good citizens to retain arms, the repeal of the Arms Act would only enable the rabble to cut each others' throats, as was amply demonstrated at Agra and Etawah on the occasion of the Rama, Lila, and Ida festivals, about two years ago. It will be an unwise policy, I believe, on the part of Government to take any such step in a country like India, where tribal and racial jealousies and caste distinctions rule rampant. The other resolutions of the Congress do not deserve much consideration, as already Government has taken the initiative in the matter of technical education at the instance of Lord Reay. It also seems to be in contemplation to establish some sort of Indian Sandhurst, where the martial energies of the scions of the famous houses of Sikhs and Rajputs are likely to find an outlet.

In conclusion, I venture to express a hope that the memorable speech of Lord Dufferin, which marks a new era in the annals of India, will be read in the candid and fair spirit in which it was delivered, and that no party-feeling will over-ride the consideration of the momentous issues he has discussed in the statesmanlike manner which distinguishes him. There is still time for the Congress to mend its methods and measures, so as to receive the support of the people and retain at the same time the good-will of the Government.

UMA SANKAR MISRA, M.A.

IN DONEGAL.

THERE is a story in the New Testament of a band of wicked husbandmen who held forcible possession of their master's vineyard; beating, stoning, and even slaying the messengers sent by the landlord to demand the fruits in their season.

A few weeks ago the *Londonderry Sentinel*, an Irish Tory paper, fell upon this story with joy, though not, it must be said, with reverence. Here was the very thing wanted—a story for these evil days, and a story with a moral! What could be better?

The nobleman was evidently the virtuous Irish landlord, and the husbandmen were the dishonest and misguided peasants who refused to give him of his own. The moral of the whole was, of course, that righteous punishment was to come swiftly upon these evil-doers: they were to be miserably destroyed, and their holdings were to be given to others.

Mr. Benson (of whom we have heard so much lately in connection with the Olphert evictions) read this choice specimen of Scripture exposition on his way to England, and forthwith answered it in the following manner:—

"The nobleman in the parable," he said, "had himself planted that vineyard; he had made a wine-press; he had built a tower. If I remember rightly, he had fenced that vineyard. There is nothing to prevent our believing he had drained it. In short, he had made that vineyard with his own capital, and by his own care. What has Mr. Olphert contributed towards reclaiming the farms or building the houses which we have seen taken from his tenants? Has he drained his fields? has he built those houses? has he put up a gate or a fence for the farmers on his estates? That is what the *Sentinel's* appeal to the principles of the New Testament requires us to assume. Mr. Olphert's own testimony, however, has been perfectly frank; and the *Sentinel* has done a service in drawing attention to the uncontested and all-important fact that the 'wicked husbandmen' it is now denouncing have planted their vineyard for themselves."

Mr. Benson states no more than the fact. Let those who disbelieve go and see for themselves. The Irish landlord does nothing for his tenants, nothing for the land. It is difficult for any one on this side of the water to understand how this can be. We are

accustomed to landlords who drain the land, keep gates and fences in repair, build model cottages, and occupy themselves more or less with the welfare of their people. 'In Ireland it is the tenant who does everything for the land. He receives from the owner of the soil a piece of land in a state of nature, and he is left to make what he can of it. And what is this land like? It will be better for me to speak of what I have seen myself in County Donegal. All I can say is that what is not bog-land is gorse and rock, and what is not gorse and rock is bog-land. Even the Government valuation of this land (and can Government make a mistake?) is one penny per acre, or, at most, three-halfpence or twopence; but I do not think that I saw any of these twopenny acres.

Between Letterkenny and Dunfanaghy the land was very bad; but from Dunfanaghy to Falcarragh it was worse; and from Falcarragh to Glasserchoo and Derrybeg it was worst of all. Here there were fields into which no horse could be taken, where the spade was used instead of the plough, and the rake instead of the harrow. Why? Because the ground was not only thick with loose stones, but was pierced by rocks innumerable. And yet every inch of earth was made of use. Men and women, boys and girls, were digging, or sowing seed, or carefully raking the scanty earth over what had been sown. Here a patch, there a patch, wherever the unfriendly granite would let them come.

Then there was the lower ground where the soil was soaked with water, and the rushes and bog-plants alone enjoyed life. Clear brown water stood about in pools, or crept slowly over the peaty soil; and the most wretched-looking sheep that can be imagined went from hillock to hillock, cropping what they could. The food they were able to get seemed only just enough to keep them in bone—with a very little flesh and wool thrown in for appearance sake; and the wool simply hung in tatters about them.

Well, the Irish tenant braces himself to his task; and no American backwoodsman has a harder. With his own hands he clears the ground of all stones that are movable; piles them up in fences about his land, or uses them for building his house. All the draining, all the rooting out of weeds, is done by himself.

As year after year goes on the land improves. Early and late you may see him at work. His wife helps him; so do his children, great and small. He has no manure for his fields, so he goes down to the beach for seaweed, brings it home upon his back, and spreads it over the ground. He may live near the seashore, or he may live miles away, with mountains between it and his home; it is all the same to him: seaweed is the only manure possible, and he must fetch it.

We have been brought up to believe that the Irish peasantry are lazy; but I beg you now to count that belief a delusion and a snare. Not only do you see them hard at work, but you see the patches of

land which they have reclaimed side by side, in sharp contrast, with the hopeless-looking ground for which no man has yet cared; and you know that years of patient labour have created the difference between the two. There comes a day in the history of a pioneer farmer when the landlord sees that the land is reclaimed. Good! Paddy must be doing well; Paddy can pay more rent. It is really scandalous that he should be in possession of such a comfortable farm and contribute so little to his landlord's support! Up goes the rent; and the first shadow falls upon Paddy's happiness, the first check comes to his spirit of industry. And so things go on. As soon as the land produces more, or the family puts on an air of greater prosperity, up goes the rent again. I was told by one who has known Ireland intimately and long, that people are afraid of cleaning their doorsteps or of mending their children's rags lest the landlord should think them better off than they really are.

And what will you think of the following story? A servant-girl from Cork married one of the tenants of a certain noble lord in the west of Ireland. She brought with her, as a present from her mistress, an electro-silver teapot; and, proud of it and of her new home, displayed it on the kitchen-dresser. The eyes of the noble lord fell upon it on his next visit to the cottage. He inquired into the matter, heard that the teapot was a wedding present, and at once said, "I see that you are quite able to pay a shilling an acre more on your rent!" And "no sooner said than done," as the fairy tales say. I do not understand his method of reasoning, but I think he would not have been a greater robber if he had stuffed the teapot into his great-coat pocket and had gone off with it.

I saw several holdings in Donegal, the original rent of which was half-a-crown. The present rent had reached thirty shillings; and in one case it is as much as £2. What a reward of industry! What an incentive to perseverance! The landlord says in effect to a new tenant, "Here is a piece of land for you. Take it and do what you like with it. Drain and weed it, pick out its stones, dig out its boulders, make a wall or a hedge round about it, manure it with seaweed, plough and harrow it, sow it with seed, or plant it with potatoes, build a house upon it for yourself, and perhaps a byre for a cow and a pigsty for a pig. When you have done all this you shall have the reward, the joy, the privilege—of paying me thirty shillings instead of the thirty pence I ask from you at present."

Now if, through the landlord's greed, the struggle for life becomes harder every year, how is the rent paid? In several ways. Very often some of the live stock has to be sold; and as the peasant's little capital is reduced. Quite as often the rent-money comes from Paddy's relations who have emigrated to Australia or America. Faithful, affectionate creatures, always mindful of the needs of those left behind in old Ireland! From 18,000 servant-girls alone has

accustomed to landlords who drain the land, keep gates and fences in repair, build model cottages, and occupy themselves more or less with the welfare of their people. In Ireland it is the tenant who does everything for the land. He receives from the owner of the soil a piece of land in a state of nature, and he is left to make what he can of it. And what is this land like? It will be better for me to speak of what I have seen myself in County Donegal. All I can say is that what is not bog-land is gorse and rock, and what is not gorse and rock is bog-land. Even the Government valuation of this land (and can Government make a mistake?) is one penny per acre, or, at most, three-halfpence or twopence; but I do not think that I saw any of these twopenny acres.

Between Letterkenny and Dunfanaghy the land was very bad; but from Dunfanaghy to Falcarragh it was worse; and from Falcarragh to Glasserchoo and Derrybeg it was worst of all. Here there were fields into which no horse could be taken, where the spade was used instead of the plough, and the rake instead of the harrow. Why? Because the ground was not only thick with loose stones, but was pierced by rocks innumerable. And yet every inch of earth was made of use. Men and women, boys and girls, were digging, or sowing seed, or carefully raking the scanty earth over what had been sown. Here a patch, there a patch, wherever the unfriendly granite would let them come.

Then there was the lower ground where the soil was soaked with water, and the rushes and bog-plants alone enjoyed life. Clear brown water stood about in pools, or crept slowly over the peaty soil; and the most wretched-looking sheep that can be imagined went from hillock to hillock, cropping what they could. The food they were able to get seemed only just enough to keep them in bone—with a very little flesh and wool thrown in for appearance sake; and the wool simply hung in tatters about them.

Well, the Irish tenant braces himself to his task; and no American backwoodsman has a harder. With his own hands he clears the ground of all stones that are movable; piles them up in fences about his land, or uses them for building his house. All the draining, all the rooting out of weeds, is done by himself.

As year after year goes on the land improves. Early and late you may see him at work. His wife helps him; so do his children, great and small. He has no manure for his fields, so he goes down to the beach for seaweed, brings it home upon his back, and spreads it over the ground. He may live near the seashore, or he may live miles away, with mountains between it and his home; it is all the same to him: seaweed is the only manure possible, and he must fetch it.

We have been brought up to believe that the Irish peasantry are lazy; but I beg you now to count that belief a delusion and a snare. Not only do you see them hard at work, but you see the patches of

land which they have reclaimed side by side, in sharp contrast, with the hopeless-looking ground for which no man has yet cared; and you know that years of patient labour have created the difference between the two. There comes a day in the history of a pioneer farmer when the landlord sees that the land is reclaimed. Good! Paddy must be doing well; Paddy can pay more rent. It is really scandalous that he should be in possession of such a comfortable farm and contribute so little to his landlord's support! Up goes the rent; and the first shadow falls upon Paddy's happiness, the first check comes to his spirit of industry. And so things go on. As soon as the land produces more, or the family puts on an air of greater prosperity, up goes the rent again. I was told by one who has known Ireland intimately and long, that people are afraid of cleaning their doorsteps or of mending their children's rags lest the landlord should think them better off than they really are.

And what will you think of the following story? A servant-girl from Cork married one of the tenants of a certain noble lord in the west of Ireland. She brought with her, as a present from her mistress, an electro-silver teapot; and, proud of it and of her new home, displayed it on the kitchen-dresser. The eyes of the noble lord fell upon it on his next visit to the cottage. He inquired into the matter, heard that the teapot was a wedding present, and at once said, "I see that you are quite able to pay a shilling an acre more on your rent!" And "no sooner said than done," as the fairy tales say. I do not understand his method of reasoning, but I think he would not have been a greater robber if he had stuffed the teapot into his great-coat pocket and had gone off with it.

I saw several holdings in Donegal, the original rent of which was half-a-crown. The present rent had reached thirty shillings; and in one case it is as much as £2. What a reward of industry! What an incentive to perseverance! The landlord says in effect to a new tenant, "Here is a piece of land for you. Take it and do what you like with it. Drain and weed it, pick out its stones, dig out its boulders, make a wall or a hedge round about it, manure it with seaweed, plough and harrow it, sow it with seed, or plant it with potatoes, build a house upon it for yourself, and perhaps a byre for a cow and a pigsty for a pig. When you have done all this you shall have the reward, the joy, the privilege—of paying me thirty shillings instead of the thirty pence I ask from you at present."

Now if, through the landlord's greed, the struggle for life becomes harder every year, how is the rent paid? In several ways. Very often some of the live stock has to be sold; and so the peasant's little capital is reduced. Quite as often the rent-money comes from Paddy's relations, who have emigrated to Australia or America. Faithful, affectionate creatures, always mindful of the needs of those left behind in old Ireland! From 1800

come, in the space of five or six years, the sum of £250,000. Each girl has managed to send home £2 or £3 every year. Is it not hard that these savings should go straight into the pocket of the landlord, instead of being used to add to the comfort of the girl's relations, or of being laid aside for her own old age? The third, and saddest, source of the rent-money is the child-labour of Donegal. I do not know whether small children are sent into service in other parts of Ireland, but it is more than likely. Of Donegal I can speak with certainty, for we heard from one person after another of the hiring-fair and its sad consequences. Father Kelly of Dunfanaghy (a noble and self-sacrificing man, true friend and guide of his people), begged us to talk wherever we went of what he calls "child-slavery."

It comes about in this way. When the struggle for existence grows too great to be borne, the tenant-farmer has to send away his little children into service. There is a hiring-fair on the 12th of May; and to it father and mother go, sadly and unwillingly, taking with them perhaps a boy of ten and a girl of seven. Some farmer from the Lagan country takes one child; another farmer carries off the other. The child of seven will have £1 for six months' service; the child of ten will perhaps get £1 10s. People who have seen these hiring-fairs tell me that the sight is heartrending. The parents dare not attempt a good-bye, but slip away and hide themselves somewhere till the little ones are out of sight. The life of the children during the six months is of the roughest. They clean out byres, mind the cattle, and do all kinds of outdoor work. They have their daily food, and some kind of a place to sleep in; but there is no schooling for them—Sunday or week-day—no mental or moral training of any kind. They are not even taken to church or sent to the priest for catechism. Their mode of life is more like that of the animals they tend than that of human children. In the midst of all this their love of home and their loyalty to their parents continue. Not a penny of their earnings is spent, and when the six months' servitude is at an end, they will walk all the way home, keeping along by the railway-line as far as it goes, and will bring the whole of their pound or thirty shillings "to help with the rent." In some cases the bargain is for more than six months; and parents and children may be separated for years. Charles McGinley (a tenant of Mr. Olphert, who is now under sentence of two months' hard labour for resisting eviction) told me that he has a little daughter of thirteen who has been away in Lagan for three years. "Her mother," he said, "makes her bits of clothes and sends them to her, and she sends me every penny of her wages to help me with the rent. But I can't go to see her, nor she come to see me; and it is three years now that she has been away." The sadness of the man's tone, the keen suffering in his face, cannot be put into words. But the worst result of this child-servitude is not seen until after many

days. Who are these Irish people of our great times? Where did they come from? Drunken, ignorant, lazy, and improvident; always in the depths of poverty; despised by the townsfolk among whom they dwell, bringing disgrace upon Ireland which Ireland does not deserve—who are they? They are the children of twenty, forty, sixty years ago, who had to forego the shelter of home, the loving care of father and mother, and all religious training and education, in order that the landlord might have his rent.

Wherever we went in that corner of Donegal we heard the same story—the people could only just keep themselves in life. It often made me think of the tale we all know of a sledge chased by wolves; how, first one horse and then another is let loose in the hope of checking pursuit, how shot after shot is fired, and still the hungry pack comes on, and how, at last, there is nothing for it but utter, hopeless defeat and ghastly death.

If the landlord goes on raising the rent, even American and Australian money will be of none effect. And if it be only just possible to live when harvest and potato-crop are good and prices of stock are high, what must it be when the bad times come? Last year the potato-crop failed. There has not been so great a failure since the famine year of awful memory. The people were obliged at last to eat the potatoes they had set aside for seed; and since November they have been living on Indian meal. "But if we can only get plenty of meal we don't mind!" said one old man cheerily. We heard of some people at Gweedore who were mixing seaweed with their Indian meal to make it go the further. Head-Constable Mahoney, when questioned concerning this in court by Mr. Conybeare, admitted that he had seen one woman preparing seaweed for dinner; "but," he added, "it was undoubtedly done to put on an appearance because she knew that so many constables and so many Rifles were coming that way!" Mahoney also gravely declared that the condition of the people had improved during the last twenty years. The food, for instance, was better. And yet, the moment after, he had to confess that no butter was used, and no meat—nothing but tea and bread. It was convenient to know nothing about the failure of the potato-crop and the feeding on Indian meal—and accordingly Mahoney knew nothing. It may be asked, Why keep up the fight for existence at such painful odds? Why not leave home and country and start life again somewhere across the seas? To this I can answer only by other questions. If you had sunk £500, £800, £100 in your bit of land (as so many of these tenants have), would you care to go and leave it all and thereby lose it? For, mark you, in Ireland there is no compensation given for improvements on outlay. And, apart from the money value of the holding, is there not a peculiar affection for the thing you have made with your own hands? Why throw away the labour of years? And then, again, the Irishman's love of country

is strong; and why should he be forced to leave his country simply because his landlord asks more from him than he has a right to ask? Let me give you a few examples from the Olphert estate alone of the way in which things are managed under a reign of "law and order." A tenant named Spaulen whose potato-crop, like those of his neighbours, failed last year, has had an ejectment-decree hanging over him for some months. In January last he scraped together every penny of his own, borrowed money besides, and thus managed to pay £12 10s. to Mr. Olphert. This is not the whole of the rent due, but is, I believe, a good slice out of it. In spite of this payment the ejectment-notice still threatens him, and no receipt has ever been given him for the £12 10s. The estate-agent's clerk acknowledged this under cross-examination during the Falcarragh trials. It seemed to me when I heard this that it was very unbusiness-like to withhold a receipt almost into May for money paid last January. But an Irish solicitor explained to some of us that evening that the receipt was being kept back on purpose. The giving the receipt to the tenant would neutralize the decree of ejectment, and would declare a renewal of tenancy. This seems to point to a determination in Mr. Olphert's mind to get rid of his tenants, with or without reason. Mr. Conybeare asked him what he would do if he succeeded in clearing his tenantry from off the face of his estate. His answer was, "Oh, I shall have my land!" What he will do with his land when he gets it is more than any one can tell. He drove off one set of tenants a generation ago and filled their places with sheep from the Highlands of Scotland; but the sheep died, and died, and died, because there was so little for them to eat.

Mr. T. W. Russell (anxious to prop the falling landlord) suggests grouse for the Olphert estate and for Gweedore. But he must first grow the bushes and heather for their habitation, and then import the grouse; and while Mr. Olphert is waiting for his bare acres to be turned into a happy hunting-ground he may sometimes sigh for the good old days when he had tenants to give him an income of £2200 a year.

That the idea of extermination is in the air may be guessed at from two small instances. An emergency-man said one day at Falcarragh, a few weeks ago, that if he had his will he would bring regiment after regiment of soldiers into Ireland and simply shoot the people down. And during the late evictions, an officer of the King's Royal Rifles, who paid the rent for an old woman, and thereby saved her from being turned out, was quietly removed in two days' time to another part of the country.

And now for the case of Paddy Doohan. He was in possession of two holdings which ran side by side. One had been his father's before him, and had been in the family forty years; the other he had taken only four years ago. He had then added a piece to his house, and the dividing line of the two holdings ran straight through

his kitchen. He had paid the rent on one holding but not on the other, and when the day of eviction came he presented himself against being turned out of both, and claimed the right to remain in one half of the house. Patrick O'Brien, M.P., who was present, asked to see the plan of the estate. The two holdings were being marked upon a property, but the house was not; and Doohan could not prove his case. Hewson, the agent, admitted that "it looked like it," and said that he had a better map down at his office. Mr. O'Brien then asked for one day's grace for Doohan, so that the map might be consulted; at the same time pointing out to Hewson that no extra expenditure would be involved, and that all the forces of armed constabulary, King's Royal Rifles, Scots Greys, and emergency-men (to say nothing of the battering-ram), would be at the agent's disposal next day as easily as to-day. Neither Doohan's protests nor Mr. O'Brien's pleadings were of avail. The tenant was coolly told that if he were in the right he could seek a legal remedy afterwards; and was then and there evicted.

Another iniquitous case is that of James McGinley. It came out unexpectedly in court during the late trials at Falcarragh, and had somewhat the effect of a small bombshell. The Crown solicitor called as one of his witnesses a grey-headed man named Wilkinson, who is clerk of Falcarragh Petty Sessions, and who had been sitting at a high desk all the time of the trial in his place of importance. As he came down to take his oath the Crown solicitor remarked complacently that this was "only" a short witness. He had only a few formal questions to ask him, and Mr. Conybeare's cross-examination began. Then it came out that this very Wilkinson had once been a tenant of Mr. Olphert (his brother was in actual possession, but he himself was the tenant). The brother and he between them got into difficulties and had to go. Mr. Olphert made Wilkinson look for another tenant to take the farm, and Wilkinson fell upon McGinley, and arranged that he should take it for £150. McGinley at once paid £2 deposit, and then Wilkinson told the landlord that the bargain was complete. About a month after this, Wilkinson and the landlord actually made an agreement under the Land Act for fifteen years at a rent of £15. (Wilkinson, by the way, had paid £15 7s., so that the rent was now reduced, but only by seven shillings.) McGinley was carefully kept in ignorance of this agreement. He did not find it out until about twelve months afterwards, when he had paid down £180 out of the £150. Too late to draw back then! The greater part of the money was paid. Wilkinson had used it "to clear the land and to pay his brother's debts"; and the secret agreement prevented the incoming tenant from going into the Land Courts to ask for a reduction of the rent. This was only in 1884, and already long before the fifteen years are up McGinley is in difficulties. He owes, however, only one year's rent, and it was

overdue only by two months when the ejectment-notice was served upon him. And where do you think the greater part of the £100 came from? From McGinley's son in Australia.

I went to see him one Saturday evening, and found him and his family packing up some of their things in the expectation of being turned out on the following Monday. I do not know how many evicted people he was at that time sheltering under his roof. We saw several. One of them was a very old woman, and another was a baby of three weeks old. Not one of these poor creatures knew where to go if McGinley's shelter failed; but they were resolved not to go to the workhouse. They were all wonderfully cheerful and composed; and McGinley was quite happy because he had heard of Mr. Conybeare's handling his case in court.

This was in April. On the last Monday in May the long-looked-for eviction came. McGinley received the sub-sheriff with courtesy and stated his case. The sub-sheriff agreed with him that it was hard, but advised him to give up possession quietly.

"Not till all fails me," said poor McGinley, "I might as well die inside."

Then the siege began: 150 Rifles and 100 police formed a wide cordon about the house, but very soon the police were attacking as heartily and as savagely as the emergency-men themselves. McGinley and two other men held the fort for some time, but at last a large hole was made in the roof, and the enemy descended. The garrison made no resistance after this, and yet Houston, the head emergency-man, rushed at McGinley and felled him with a hatchet, and a constable named Smith seized him by the throat and all but strangled him. Then the old man (he is sixty-five years of age) was brought out a prisoner, the cut on his head bleeding profusely—was taken to the barracks that his wound might be dressed—and was then carried to Derry gaol.

The end is not yet. James McGinley is to be tried for the crime of resisting the sheriff; and it is absolutely necessary that English eyes should watch the doings of the Coercion Court.

The foregoing stories of Smullen, Doohan, and McGinley all came out in court at the hands of Mr. Conybeare. The story I am now going to tell you I took down from the woman's own lips. Kate Coyle is her name; a cheery little body, mother of thirteen ("buried seven," she said)—has two girls and a boy in America—and is now a widow. Thirteen years ago she got behind with her rent and was to be evicted. But Mr. Olphert, apparently thinking better of the matter, suggested to her that if she would only pay him £5 costs, he "would not meddle with her just then." All she had was one cow, and she sold it for £5. "Cows were not very dear just then," she explained. She carried the money to Mr. Olphert; and he—what did he do? As soon as he got it he turned her out. She and her little

children were evicted one frosty morning. Their sole refuge was then a barn with one window, which her husband had built and slated with his own hands when he was "only a slip of a lad"; and there she has lived for the last thirteen years. The rent of the ground on which this one-windowed barn stands is £6 2s. 6d. I asked her how many acres she had, but she only knew that the land was what was called "three cows' grass." In addition to the £6 2s. 6d. she had to pay the poor-rate. Thirteen years ago this was nineteen shillings; last year it had come down to seven shillings. Three years ago Kate Coyle was "short in her rent" again. This time she sold a bullock, and her daughter let her have all her little savings. These savings had come from the rearing of "a little flock on a bit of land down by the sea." Mother and daughter in this way scraped together rather more than £9 and took the money to Mr. Olphert. Before he would accept the £9 due to him he made Mrs. Coyle pay down ten shillings for costs.

Since then she has paid no rent. She told us that Mr. Olphert "never gives a halfpenny of reduction." On the 26th of last April she was turned out of her house. The eviction, she was told, would take place at four o'clock in the afternoon; but at half-past eight in the morning in walked the agent's clerk with a paper in his hand, stood with his back to the fire and said, "I have taken possession of this house." "Well," she said, very quietly, "you have got hold of a good house."

We saw the outside of it next day. A broken jug and a four-legged stool were lying there, and a cupboard smashed by the emergency-men as they threw it out of the house. The poor woman stood with us looking at these things, but she neither made complaint nor shed tears. The cheerful courage of these people is marvellous.

The Plan of Campaign has come to the help of the tenants. It shows them how to unite together to make a firm stand against the lawless evictions of the landlord. If strikes and trades' unions are wrong and mischievous, the Plan of Campaign is wrong and mischievous too; but are they? and is it?

The Barons of old combined against King John; Hampden and his friends refused to pay ship-money; humbler people in later days have found themselves compelled to resist injustice and tyranny in the shape of long hours and low wages. Is it a crime to ask for justice?

Not in England, not in Wales, not in Scotland. Why must Ireland alone bear her miseries, and be dumb?

HOME AFFAIRS.

ALL keen interest in the Parliamentary Session has been suddenly extinguished. During the holidays there was prospect of a good deal of storm and fury in the final interval before the Prorogation—it disappeared in a moment once Parliament returned to work at Westminster. There may be an outburst now and then before the end is reached, but in any case it must be fitful and temporary—a mere sputtering in the embers. As a matter of fact the Tories themselves, whose duty it is to see the Government successfully through any possible surprise, are turning their attention to the platform, and preparing for a big campaign against their opponents, who, with less responsibility, have latterly been making the running in the constituencies. There are indeed further indications that the Ministerialists are fast approaching the period which, to them at any rate, will be a time of *Sturm und Drang*. Already there is serious talk among the rank and file of the Tory party of the possibility of a general election in the autumn of next year. It is foreseen that to tackle either of the greater Irish problems has a multitude of dangers for the Government. Yet the attempt must be made. Nothing can save them from dealing, say, with the Land Question next year. They have postponed it to the last moment consistent with any sort of prudence. A session of dawdling would bring them great disrepute. It could not be denied that they were manœuvring merely to avoid disaster to themselves. And this would have its effect with the country. To do them justice the Tories as a body are quite alive to these considerations, and it is pretty certain that they will hold their chiefs to their public pledges. As for the Liberal Unionists, they are most uncomfortable under the pressure of criticism, and profess to be quite anxious for the inauguration of that “active policy of conciliation in Ireland” of which Lord Hartington spoke recently at Birmingham. Their hyper-sensitive minds are revolted by the notion that they lie under suspicion of being coercionists pure and simple. We all know, of course, that they are nothing of the sort—they never cease saying so—and, certainly, with the nearer approach of a general election, it is likely they will desire to establish some other sort of claim upon public opinion. Hence there is good reason to think that the beginning of next year will see them, rampant, for a serious effort of Irish legislation. Whichever way we look therefore there is clear indication that this Parliament is reaching the critical stage. A check in the conduct of the Irish Land Bill may

precipitate the fall of the Government, and, though for ourselves we have a strong belief that the allies will hang on as long as possible in dread of going before the constituencies, it is the clear duty of our party to be prepared for any emergency. The general election may come next autumn—it is said by well-informed people that Lord Salisbury himself expects as much—but whether it comes sooner or later, our business is to be ready for it.

Mr. Smith's statement on the re-assembling of the House of Commons after the Whitsun holidays is responsible for the change in the situation. By postponing the Sugar Convention Bill until next year, and by limiting the remaining business of the Session to the matters already before it, and most of which are practically non-contentious, there is obviously a comparatively dull time before us between now and the middle of August, when the prorogation is expected. The suspension of the Sugar Bill is a serious blow to a strong Government, and must be considered in a little detail in its place. In regard to the general arrangement of business, two considerations mainly influenced Mr. Smith. First, he desired to please his friends by an early adjournment—he did not wish to call upon the House for the extreme effort of last year—and next it was needful to justify the character of the Session as "a Scotch Session" by giving some prominence to Scotch legislation. So it comes about that two of the series of four Bills on Scotch local government are to be pushed forward, together with the Scotch Universities Bill. Mr. Balfour hopes to pass his Irish Main Drainage and Light Railway Bills, and Mr. Smith has charge of a measure for establishing a Board of Agriculture. A "small measure" for facilitating the recovery of tithe rent charge, in lieu of the series of Bills which have appeared during the past two Sessions, is also promised, and the Lord Chancellor has a Land Transfer Bill before the Peers. The only Bills of importance which have already passed the Commons are the National Defence Bill and the Budget Bill, so that the Government programme, even if it is fully realized, is sufficiently modest. But there is small likelihood of all the Bills getting through. The Land Transfer Bill is certainly doomed—it pleases nobody but its author—and as to the Bill which is to help the Welsh parsons to recover tithe from the Nonconformist farmers, it will surely be warmly contested. *Per contra*, there is before the House an Intermediate Education Bill for Wales, which ought to pass. Drawn by a private member, and backed by the whole of the Welsh representatives, it has been taken up by the Government, and there seems no sufficient reason why it should not be put on the Statute Book. If the Government are wise they will take care not to miss an excellent opportunity of settling a question which has been too long neglected, so as to give their otherwise rather meagre list of achievements some sort of attraction within the Principality. For looking over Mr. Smith's scheme of work, we find that various

promises have miscarried. What has become of the District Councils Bill? And where is Mr. Balfour's measure for consolidating the administration of Irish land, now in the hands of four or five separate Departments? Mr. Goschen's Bill for dealing with the currency was publicly abandoned before the holidays, so was the Bill for controlling the promotion of public companies. The result is that we shall probably hear nothing more of them during the life of this Parliament. Next Session the bigger measures will occupy too much time and attention.

This last observation brings us to what is called "the newest phase of the Irish question." We use the language of Mr. Balfour. For ourselves we recognize no new phase. The other day at Oxford Mr. Asquith, a rising member of our party—whose speeches show much careful reflection—alluded to the results which must follow the retention of the Irish members at Westminster, now very generally desired under any scheme of Home Rule. Applying a rigorous logic to the situation which would arise, Mr. Asquith said: "Either the retention of the Irish members at Westminster must be provisional, or the retention of the English and Scotch local business in the Imperial Parliament must be provisional." And it was then put to the party leaders that they should state clearly how they would get over this dilemma. A few hours later Mr. Gladstone appeared at St. Austell, in the course of a tour to which further reference must be made, and used certain language which, from the attention it has received, deserves quotation. He said: "You are aware that Welshmen and Scotchmen as well as Irishmen are beginning to think that something is due to the principle of nationality. You know perfectly well that they do not mean by it anything adverse to the unity of the Empire. No one would dare to bring against the Scotch or Welsh an accusation so preposterous. That is reserved for our Irish fellow-subjects, upon whom so many of our countrymen have been too long accustomed to trample. But it is the Liberal party that will have to consider what subjects there are that ought to be dwelt upon with some considerable regard not only to what England thinks, but to what Scotland thinks in Scotch matters, and to what Wales may think in Welsh matters." Mr. Gladstone declared that Disestablishment was one of the questions so to be dealt with—a thing which, in regard to Scotland, at any rate, he has been saying for years—and he added a suggestion, in very general terms, "that you will stontly insist that we are bound to pay a certain equitable regard to the feelings prevailing in other divisions of the United Kingdom with respect to the questions that concern almost exclusively the interest of those divisions."

Certain people, who pride themselves on seeing very much further than ordinary folks, insisted that this language was an answer to Mr. Asquith—a sympathetic answer—and showed, very much to their own satisfaction at any rate, that it involved Mr. Gladstone's conversion to

a scheme of Federal Government for Great Britain, and possibly for Great Britain and the Empire. *The Spectator*, anxious to score a point, readily adopted this view, and the other night, at the dinner of the Constitutional Union, the Chief Secretary, who never reads the newspapers, got up to deal with "the very latest phase of the Home Rule question," and launched out into a tremendous denunciation of Mr. Gladstone's federal scheme, as being infinitely more absurd than "the preposterous absurdity" which he submitted to the House of Commons in 1886. Mr. Balfour and his inspirers are alike a little "previous." Mr. Gladstone said nothing which bears out the suggestion that he is prepared to throw the British Constitution into the melting-pot in this reckless fashion. We have the utmost confidence that his natural conservatism, still strong within him, will keep him now, as always, within the limits of the necessary. Thus, when Mr. Balfour draws a picture of an Imperial House of Commons being in conflict with a purely English Parliament; of the Crown consulting both, and deciding in favour of the latter, to the production of a "deadlock" and the like, we may be willing to admit that he has the faculty of imagination, for which we gave him little credit, though we can but smile at his conception. We take leave to think we are yet a long way—a very long way—from the supercession of the existing House of Commons. The Federalists have an immense amount of leeway to make up. It would perhaps be more correct to say that they are hardly in existence. To push this view of the Home Rule question is to do a very bad service to our party. If Mr. Balfour's premisses were accurate, his conclusions would stagger us. Happily they are in no sense to be trusted. Neither do we accept the alternative presented to us by Mr. Asquith. To our mind Mr. Gladstone's first scheme, which excluded the Irish members from Westminster, was the better and more logical plan. If the Irishmen lost the opportunity of joining in the management of foreign affairs they had, by way of compensation, full—almost absolute—control of their own. To do them justice they were quite content. English opinion, however, forces upon us the retention of the Irish members—and for what? Mainly that the House of Commons of the United Kingdom may be preserved intact. To suggest that there is any other reason equal in point of strength to this, is nonsense. We speak, of course, of those who have compelled the retention of the Irish. There is no doubt, among the Radical Gladstonians, a desire that the Irishmen should be at hand to help in the settlement of English and Scotch questions in the right direction. But it is not the British Radicals who have compelled Mr. Gladstone to assent to the modification of his original scheme on this head. We very much question, whether there are half a dozen men in the extreme wing of our party who are either Federalists or Federationists. Mr. Asquith himself seems merely to raise a dilemma that somebody else may satisfy him. We venture to think that he will have to swallow his logic. If we are to have the Irish

at Westminster, either in their present or in diminished numbers, we shall have to let their vote unchecked, and keep undisturbed existing arrangements. Their position will be anomalous and unsatisfactory, but we must put up with it. To apply a rigorous logic to circumstances of this sort is tempting enough. The remedy would, however, be vastly worse than the disease. The British public will give Home Rule, and, as we believe, with the utmost goodwill. To ask them to uproot the House of Commons is quite another and a very different matter. Mr. Gladstone's method to do only that which is necessary, is the method of a wise statesmanship. The desire to settle everything on logical lines may be laudable, but in this world it is rarely attainable. And we are certainly not going to rush into the tremendous business of setting up a Federal Government in these islands to satisfy the logicians. Of course, Mr. Balfour knows this as well as anybody. But the pressure of speech-making in his case is severe, and, finding a taking suggestion to hand, he could not resist giving a certain freshness to his public utterances, even if it involved the development of a mare's nest. So much for "the very latest phase of the Home Rule question."

The speech at St. Austell was certainly the most notable of the numerous deliverances of Mr. Gladstone in his remarkable progress through the West of England. In point of moral elevation it fell far below the great effort at Plymouth; but its influence will probably be vastly greater than the latter. Mr. Gladstone touched upon the Liberal programme, and added to it certain important articles. First, he emphasized again the maturity of the question of "one man, one vote," and of land law reform, and, after a significant fling at bi-metallism, as "our old friend Protection under a cabalistic name," he declared for the equalization of the death duties. In this connection we looked for a popular exposition of the new Estates Tax; but somehow it was not forthcoming. Mr. Gladstone had more important matter in hand. He explained in much detail his position on the question of Disestablishment as it applies to Scotland and to Wales. We know, of course, that, like Lord Hartington, he has long been friendly to a "national" treatment of this question—that Scotch Disestablishment should be decided by the people of Scotland. And at St. Austell he recognized that Scotland had spoken with sufficient clearness; that Wales had spoken equally clearly, since each country had taken a couple of divisions in the House of Commons, with the result of showing a large majority of its members persistently in favour of Disestablishment. As to himself, he had held aloof, on the principle laid down by Lord Hartington, who had been his leader in this matter, and rather to discourage English members from intervening; but now that he had full and unequivocal evidence of the sense of the two countries on the subject, "when the question is pushed forward with respect to one country or the other, I shall be ready to render a distinct account of my opinion."

Again, "I shall not flinch from entering into the division lobby, and from what I have said you may, perhaps, be able to conjecture as to what my vote will be." This being said "in a county inhabited very largely by conscientious Nonconformists," it was naturally received with enthusiasm. Mr. Gladstone has nailed his colours to the mast, and Disestablishment for Scotland and for Wales is now a distinct article of our party programme. What the Liberal leader said of English Disestablishment is hardly less interesting. He puts the settlement beyond the period of his own life, for there has not yet been in England a distinct pronouncement of the national vote. If ever it comes, it will, in Mr. Gladstone's opinion, come to a prepared people—"it will come, I trust, without the bitterness of present party conflict, to a great religious community, which will have learned before that time to disavow all slavish dependence upon the temporal and secular arm, which will know that the Establishment is one thing and the Church another, and which will have ample means (if the spirit be not wanting) to fill up whatever void may be caused by the withdrawal of the support from national property which the Church may be now considered to receive." These remarks upon the Church question have given the enemy a very bad quarter of an hour. Their surprise was such as to produce a temporary loss of reason, and Mr. Gladstone was accused of the most shocking levity. That a man should in one speech propose to uproot the Church throughout Great Britain, and to rend the British Constitution, in order to give Home Rule alike to Scotland, Wales, and Ireland—for this, of course, was the only meaning which could possibly be put upon the language of the right hon. gentleman—was nothing short of the most awful sacrilege, abhorrent to every decently constituted human mind. The speech was overwhelmed with sarcasm, and after an interval of ten days it is still referred to as a terrible demonstration of the moral decadence of Mr. Gladstone under the influence of his alliance with Mr. Parnell. If we are to believe all that is said by the enemy, the Gladstonian party is again riven asunder, and we are face to face with another great secession. Unfortunately for this idea the Churchmen who follow Mr. Gladstone have not discovered the revelation, and are probably none of them so extremely "Churchy," to coin a phrase, as their chief. A glance at the Disestablishment division lists will set this beyond question. The Liberal members for Wales are at least half of them Churchmen, but they are all for freeing the Church in the Principality.

The progress of the Liberal leader in the West has had other results besides adding to the articles of the Liberal programme. We are assured by competent observers that it has effected an enormous change in the political feeling of Devon and Cornwall, where the Liberal Unionists monopolize more than half the representation. "The West is awake," say the party managers, and their confidence is shared by less interested folks, who have, some of them, perhaps

even a better opportunity of judging. If the wand of the great magician (to quote Lord Granville) has never waved with such success before, we are truly sorry for Mr. Courtney, who is to be chief among the victims. It is pleasant to hear that Mr. Gladstone has in no whit suffered from the enormous exertions which he made in what is facetiously called his "holiday." Indeed, he is already planning another descent on Mid-Lothian. The Tories and Liberal Unionists are searching a candidate to oppose him. Some ambitious man will, no doubt, do battle. To such it is quite enough to oppose Mr. Gladstone. It made the political fortune of Lord Cross, and the fact is not forgotten. Consequently, we quite expect that Mr. Gladstone will have to fight for his seat at the next election. But there is no danger. We have won the whole of the four seats for Edinburgh, and what Edinburgh is, Mid-Lothian is, "only more so." It is therefore to be hoped, seeing how important Mr. Gladstone's health is to the cause of Ireland, that his autumn campaign in Scotland will be arranged in full view of the fact that it will be no longer June, and that what might be done without hurt in sunny Cornwall may involve endless risks in the stark air of a Scotch coast district in "chill October."

To go back to affairs in Parliament, we find the Sugar Bounties Bill not abandoned, but suspended. Mr. Smith says plausibly that, as the Convention cannot in any case come into operation before 1891, it will be quite soon enough to pass the Bill next year. Knowing what we do of the work which Parliament will have before it next Session, we cannot believe that this is quite sincere. There is strong presumption that the Bill will not be revived. No doubt the Government hesitate to make the confession. It offends their pride, since it shows their continental friends how weak they are when they get down from the anti-Irish horse. Besides, did not Lord Salisbury call the Powers together to suppress the Bounties in the full assurance that he would be doing his party a rare stroke? It is too true; but true also it is that Lord Salisbury has blundered, and that in this matter, at least, he cannot have his way. It would be better for many reasons if the blunder were acknowledged and the Convention torn up. We speak as a candid friend. To us the tactics of the Government are eminently useful. As long as there is any sort of chance of the revival of the Bill, we shall have a whip for the Ministerialists and their so-called Liberal allies. And there are those among us who will not hesitate to use it with right goodwill.

Several new Bills have seen the light during the month, and remain in the shortened programme of business. Mr. Smith has introduced the long-expected measure to constitute a Board of Agriculture. It will replace the Committee of Agriculture of the Privy Council, and take over the work of the present Land Commission, and power is to be secured to transfer to it by Order in

Council such other work as may from time to time be found desirable. The "Board" will consist of a President (it is understood Mr. Chaplin), who will represent the Department in the House of Commons, of certain members of the Cabinet, and "such other persons as Her Majesty may appoint." A salary equal to that of the Presidents of the Local Government Board and of the Board of Trade is to be provided for the Parliamentary chief of the Department, but it is not to be paid if the post is occupied at any time by "one of the great officers of State." Some of these provisions have given much dissatisfaction to the country party. They object to the constitution of the Board, as affording no extensive agricultural experience, and there is generally a suspicion that the scheme is somewhat of a sham. From the Liberal side, the objection is taken that it is extremely undesirable to add to the paid Ministers of the Crown, and it seems not improbable that the Government will meet this by making Mr. Chaplin Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster—which will give him a considerable salary—and then appointing him to the Presidency of the new Board of Agriculture. Mr. Balfour's Irish Bills are partly the remnants of last year. The Bills for dealing with the drainage of the Shannon, the Barrow, the Bann, and the Suck are variously regarded by the Irish members, but it does not appear that there will be any serious opposition to them. And the Light Railways Bill has had a really cordial welcome. It amends Sir G. Trevelyan's Tramways Act which has had a fair amount of success, and it proposes certain specific railway extensions through the congested districts of the West. The question of gauge is left open, but the Government are anxious to encourage existing railway companies to become promoters of new companies, and offer whatever amount of money is necessary to induce them to construct. A local guarantee is to be taken to cover any possible loss in working the lines, but the rate is fixed at not more than 6*d.* in the pound, and the ratepayers are to have the right of saying whether any scheme shall or shall not proceed. The total expenditure is fixed at £600,000, and, adding to this the sum set aside for the execution of the drainage schemes, there is here a clear gift of nearly another million to Ireland. Mr. Balfour rather plumes himself upon his generosity—he says nothing about repayment—but one would like to ask those persons who objected so strongly to Mr. Gladstone's Irish Land Scheme as risking the money of the British taxpayers, what they think of this sort of thing? Mr. Storey speaks out plainly, and says that the money for Irish local public works should be found by a Home Rule Government in Dublin. But Mr. Chamberlain, who led the revolt against the Land Bill, not because it *gave* money, but because it *risked* it, is dumb as usual.

Before touching briefly upon the general condition of Ireland, something ought to be said of the movement which came to such a head last month for the abolition of the Viceroyalty. The Ulster Tories

and their allies in the Irish peerage were quite agreed at the meeting at Lord Waterford's that the Lord-Lieutenancy should be extinguished, and that its more ceremonial functions should be handed over to a Prince of the Blood, who should make his home in Ireland. They appointed a deputation to wait on Lord Salisbury, and asked him to give them a day. The answer was delayed, and finally the day was fixed sufficiently far forward, so that the morning the deputation were to go to Arlington Street they learnt that Lord Zetland had been appointed to succeed Lord Londonderry in the Viceregal office. The Prime Minister was said to have gone through the alphabetical list of the peerage, and to have saved himself at Z. But as he did save himself, he was able to tell the influential gentlemen who called upon him that the subject of the abolition of the Viceroyalty was a very important one—that it must be a matter of complicated legislation, and legislation could not be introduced this Session—and generally, that he would consult his colleagues on the matter. The Irish Tories and their backers in the Press are naturally not a little bit disappointed, and there is talk of raising a debate when the Irish Votes come up in the Commons. Of course they will take nothing by this move if they make it, and must possess their souls in patience. The story goes that Lord Hartington came to Lord Salisbury's help, and induced Lord Zetland, a Liberal Unionist, to go to Dublin. As long as Mr. Balfour is governor of Ireland, it is of small moment who is at the Lord-Lieutenant's Lodge in Phoenix Park. We shall have the same weary round of circumstances—of evictions resisted, of tenants sent to gaol for refusing to give possession, with an occasional outburst of serious crime. The one Bill which would be of some use in Ireland—an Arrears Bill—is deliberately withheld, and the means of perpetrating injustice is consequently still in the hands of the landlords. Meanwhile not the slightest effort is made by the Government to mediate between the parties. In Germany, as we saw during the recent colliery disputes, intervention by the Government would be prompt and decisive. But in Ireland the law, right or wrong, must be upheld. The prospect would be gloomy indeed if a general election were not steadily approaching. Since last we wrote Mr. Olphert has carried out his evictions at Glasserchoo in the Gweedore district, Lord Lansdowne has turned out numerous families at Luggacurran, and Lord Massereene, Colonel Tottenham, and Mr. Ponsonby have been equally busy. It would be interesting to learn the exact number of people who have been rendered homeless. Mr. Ponsonby is acting with the view of planting his estate with "Protestants," after the fashion of Lord Massereene, and very probably with the help of the Anti-Plan of Campaign Committee. This "colonization" is a risky business: the Protestant farmers, entering upon the occupation of lands from which the previous tenants have been evicted, will be marked men, and in the long nights of next

winter they will probably have many anxious moments. We hope sincerely that the Government will be able so to protect them that no harm may befall them; but it is impossible to overlook the extreme dangers of the situation. Mr. Carew, M.P., has been released from Kilmainham on account of ill-health, before the expiration of his sentence.

The Special Commission adjourned over the Whitsun holidays. The principal witness before the adjournment was Mr. William O'Brien, M.P. He admitted that he was a sympathizer with Fenianism, though he had not taken the oath. It was one of the things he was proudest of that they trusted him without exacting the oath. Outrage did not begin with the Land League; the League diminished crime. He drew a distinction between criminality and illegality. "As to the former, there is an honest inherent abhorrence of it in the Irish people. But as to illegality—mere reverence for the law as law—well, illegality is bred in us." On one occasion only had he advised resistance to the law, and that was at Mitchelstown, in 1888, against eviction which robbed tenants of the benefits of an Act which was within two days of passing. No one was a penny the worse for his advice. Boycotting was constitutional if it did not include intimidation—to inconvenience a man in his food arrangements was legitimate. He drew the line at danger to life or limb. It would be highly objectionable to put those who did not join the League in a black list, though a list of members might be published without offence. As editor of *United Ireland* his object was to conduct it as a constitutional organ. Mr. Parnell's distinct instructions were that the paper was to be conducted within constitutional lines, and in accordance with the principles of his movement. Asked if he excluded the word "loyal" in this connection, Mr. O'Brien replied that there were two sorts of loyalty, that born of affection and that of respect for force. "Force I bow to, both in my paper and elsewhere; affection I had none, and never pretended that I had, until 1885." He made public profession of his regret for his attacks on Lord Spencer and Sir George Trevelyan, whom he made responsible for the acts of subordinates, though he still thinks that at least six innocent persons were hanged and others sent into penal servitude during their régime. He objected to the description of Allen, Larkin, and O'Brien as "the Manchester murderers," saying that what they did was a perfectly open and honest bit of warfare, in the course of which, by the merest accident, a policeman lost his life. In a state of semi-belligerency, such as there was at that time, it was no criminal thing for men, openly taking the risks, to attempt the rescue of one of their colleagues. They were honoured by Irishmen all the world over, and by himself among the rest. Mr. Parnell and Mr. Davitt, sitting together in the well of the court, endorsed this remark with a "Hear, hear," and, upon the Attorney-General calling attention to the fact, the President observed that it was most

unbecoming, and if he knew who had done it he would order them to leave the court. In that place the event at Manchester must be regarded as murder. We have put together certain points of Mr. O'Brien's evidence, Mr. O'Brien being a person of position in the Irish party, to show its general character. Those who have followed him have kept much in his lines. Some of them have had to make explanation of awkward speeches—Mr. Biggar his complacent allusion to Hartmann, the Nihilist—but it is remarkable how little the Attorney-General has been able to damage the witnesses. And in no one case—and this is highly significant—has counsel for the *Times* ever ventured to put to a witness any suggestion that he was himself concerned in criminal proceedings. Mr. Davitt will be the next important person examined, and it is hoped that the whole of the evidence will be before the Court before the Long Vacation. Mr. Parnell is to be recalled by the *Times* to answer concerning the Land League books. Meanwhile the libel action, "*Parnell v. Walter and others*," in which the defendants have paid 40s. into court, has been postponed until the Special Commission has concluded. The *Times* wants the Report of the Commission to influence the jury, but two judges of the Queen's Bench have laid it down as distinctly as words can do it, that the Report of the Commission ought to have nothing whatever to do with the libel case, and ought, indeed, to be rigorously excluded from it. The *Times* is therefore not likely to take the advantage on which it was calculating in obtaining the delay.

The House of Commons debate on bi-metallism came to nothing, since there was only time for the initial speeches, and it was adjourned *sine die*. We shall hear nothing more of the subject in this Session, but if the International Monetary Congress, which meets in Paris in the autumn, can agree upon a ratio and can secure fixity, about which we have some doubt, the Bi-metallic League will have a much stronger case, and will be able to push their propaganda with more success. Lord Salisbury is "sitting on the fence," but Mr. Goschen and Mr. Balfour are believed to be favourable to the double standard. Mr. W. H. Smith is probably on the other side, with Mr. Gladstone and Sir W. Harcourt.

The Queen's Bench, by two judges to one—the Lord Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Manisty against Baron Pollock—have decided against the claim of the Bishop of London to veto proceedings against the Dean and Chapter of St. Paul's in respect of the new Reredos. The episcopal bench are vastly alarmed, since it is thought the result will be to increase the litigious spirit among Churchmen, and Dr. Temple is being advised to take the opinion of the Court of Appeal.

The terrible railway "accident" to an excursion train near Armagh, which has resulted in the death of seventy-five persons and a shocking list of injured, will probably force from Parliament a Bill making it compulsory upon railway companies to use an automatic brake.

GIORDANO BRUNO: HIS LIFE AND PHILOSOPHY.

IN 1885 an English National Committee in connection with one that was International (begun ten years earlier, we believe) was formed to procure the erection of a monument to Giordano Bruno, as a fitting though tardy tribute of the gratitude due from men of science and philosophy of all nations to the Italian philosopher; and on the 9th of last June this design saw completion. At about 10.30 on that morning, amid an immense crowd, and with the advantage of glorious weather, the procession, consisting of six thousand representatives of the Association, with nineteen hundred and seventy banners and standards, together with about one hundred musicians, wended its way to the Campo dei Fiori, where, on February 17, 1600, Giordano Bruno was burnt alive. Its arrival there was the signal for immense acclamation, while the banners were gradually placed around the monument. At eleven precisely, trumpets were blown to announce that the unveiling of the statue was about to take place. The writer of these pages was not fortunate enough to be present, and therefore cannot speak with the authority of an eye-witness; but according to Italian newspapers that have been received, the statue is in all respects worthy of the occasion, being one of the finest and most completely finished works of the eminent Italian sculptor, Ettore Ferrari. The philosopher is represented as being buried in profound thought, having in his left hand a book, which he has just ceased to read; while his right hand presses with a sort of nervous tension that which holds the book, the contents of which are evidently the cause of the far-away look in Bruno's eyes. At the base of the monument there are, in *basso relief*, three representations of Bruno at different periods of his career—viz., one where he is arguing with the doctors of the University of Oxford; another, where his sentence of death is being pronounced upon him; a third, where that sentence is about to be fulfilled in the *Campo dei Fiori*. On another portion of the medallion there are representations of the following apostles of Free-thought: Wickliffe, Huss, Servetus, Paleario, Ramus, Sarpi, Vanini, and Campanella. On the frontage of the basement there is the following inscription by Bovio: *IX. Guigno, MDCCCLXXXIX. A Bruno—il secolo da lui divinato—qui dove il rogo—arse.*

Around this monument were placed about 150 wreaths, one

VOL. 132.—No. 2. I

bearing the inscription *Le donne triestine*. At 11.45 the senator Maleschott, the sculptor Ferrari, and Basso, the President of the Committee, ascended a platform, in order to receive certain official documents in connection with the monument; and then amid enthusiastic cries of *Viva Bruno! Viva il Martire del libero pensiero!* the statue was unveiled. A discourse by the orator Bovio completed the ceremony, and at about 12.50 the procession left the Campo dei Fiori in order to do honour to the memory of Garibaldi.

The connection of England with the monument of Bruno has brought the name of the Italian philosopher into unusual prominence in this country, while his works are still of extreme rarity. It has occurred therefore to the present writer that a few pages in description of his life and philosophy might not be unwelcome to the readers of this magazine, for their better comprehension of the position Bruno fills in the sixteenth century, and his consequent claims to be remembered by posterity.

For the readier achievement of this object it is necessary to commence with a rapid glance at the various events and influences immediately preceding or succeeding his birth. Few, if any, are entirely independent of their environment; but Bruno, notwithstanding that in many of his scientific speculations he was in advance of his age, was yet, in his personality, peculiarly the product of his own period, not merely by virtue of the interaction between organism and environment common to all, but also and even in greater degree by reaction and rebellion against the prejudices and retrograding influences of his age, which eventually brought upon him the wrath of the Inquisition and led to his death.

Giordano Bruno was born at Nola, in Naples, in 1548; five years after the death of him who had dethroned the earth from the sovereign position she had previously been believed to hold in the solar system—Copernicus. Magellan had been dead barely twenty-seven years, and the circumnavigation of the world and the new ideas resulting therefrom were still in the freshness of novelty. Luther had died in 1546, and the Church was still agitated by the great Reformer's denunciations of her enormities. Of more importance still, unhappily for Bruno, was the sudden renewal of rigour in the Inquisition, consequent probably upon the spread of Lutheranism. Nor must the Italian Renaissance with all her varied influences be left unnoticed. Her ardour for classical learning, her love for art, her practical paganism, all combined to give a hitherto unsurpassed predominance to this present world, with its interests and pursuits; to throw into shadow the vague future world, about which there was, if not explicitly, at least implicitly, considerable scepticism. Strange divergent influences truly! On the one hand, the earth with her interests, her hopes and fears, her ambitions and pursuits—the earth, that is to say, considered relatively to *man*, acquired

suddenly a supreme importance. Considered relatively to the *universe*, nay, even to that one portion of the universe called the solar system, she sank with equal suddenness to supreme insignificance—a small globe whirled round with other globes, many of which were larger than herself, in obedience to the power of their sovereign ruler the Sun. One other influence remains to be noticed, most important of all perhaps to Bruno, because of the reactionary antagonism excited within him by it—viz., the unpalatable intermixture of gross hypocrisy and abject superstition, beneath which the larger portion of the religious catholic world were sunk in Italy. It was into this chaos of divergent influences, this strange medley of new beliefs, arising from the ashes of the old, fast dying away or even already dead, that Giordano Bruno, one of the most impressionable of men, was born.

Now let us take a rapid glance at the events closely succeeding Bruno's birth in order to realize more completely the exact position he fills in the history of philosophical thought. In 1561, thirteen years after his own birth, was born Lord Bacon, the founder of the inductive philosophy; three years later, Galileo, a full believer, though a somewhat timid supporter, of the Copernican system. Ten years later than Galileo, John Kepler, the discoverer of the three laws that bear his name, was born. In 1564 our great English dramatist Shakespeare;¹ in 1632 Benedict Spinoza, and in 1646 Leibnitz. With all these writers Bruno had points in common, and if the influence he exercised upon them was not in every case direct, its indirectness must not let us lose sight of its significance. Nature is a supreme plagiarist, and the thoughts of such few among her sons as are really great she echoes and re-echoes, arraying them in various dresses, sometimes in veritable disguises; heedless apparently whether the name of their true originator survive, so long only as the thoughts themselves shall live. So far as we know, Kepler was the only writer among these that we have enumerated who confessed his indebtedness to Bruno, and he only in private correspondence. But with each of the others, especially Spinoza and Leibnitz, the resemblance is too great to be accidental, though it is quite possible the imitation was unconscious. One man soweth, another reapeth, and the seed expands and grows till it ceases to be recognizable in the fulness of the blossom; while, in their gratitude for the latter, men are apt to forget the greater importance of the former.

Giordano Bruno was born, as we have said, in 1548, his father's profession being that of a soldier. His baptismal name was Filippo, but he exchanged it for the one by which he is now known—Giordano—when he entered the Dominican convent at Naples in his fifteenth year; the very same convent where some three hundred

¹ Many German writers have considered Shakespeare to be largely indebted to Bruno, alike for several of his metaphors and some few of his scientific allusions

years previously the angelic doctor, Aquinas, had lived and studied. The Dominicans had a reputation for learning. Bruno, from a young child, had a passion for knowledge; and he tells us himself that he selected the Dominican order in preference to others because he thought that in it this passion would have greater chance of gratification. Unhappily for him, his love for knowledge grew by what it fed on. He could not content himself with the answers given to his inquiries by the monks, and from his eighteenth year doubts, especially upon the subject of the Trinity, grew upon him. Yet he so far controlled these doubts that he seems to have spent thirteen years of his life in monastic seclusion without any strong desire to leave. The seclusion was of a modified description, the Dominicans, or Preaching Brothers as they were called, being in the habit of constantly travelling about in pursuit of their religious offices. Bruno's published writings show that his official duties must have at least allowed him sufficient leisure to acquaint himself very widely with the Oriental and European writers of philosophy. In this convent he probably wrote his two earliest works—*i.e.*, the *Candle-Bearer* and the *Noah's Ark*. The latter work has disappeared; the former stands first in Wagner's Leipsic edition of his Italian works; and within the limits of this paper we intend to confine ourselves to an analysis only of such of Bruno's works as are published in Italian.

Il Candelaio, or *Candle-Bearer*, is a slight comedy, written in the taste of the period, in which Bruno satirizes Love, Alchemy, and Pedantry. It is not worthy of his later works, but it is interesting to students as a proof of the antagonism he was already beginning to feel at that early age towards the superstitions and pedantries of his contemporaries. The thirteen years spent by Bruno under monastic discipline had been by no means years of uninterrupted peace for him. Doubts of various kinds increased upon him, and the petty tyranny and love of small authority exhibited by monastic officials galled him and made him inwardly rebellious. Twice he received reprimands for some slight breach of discipline. On a third occasion the reprimand was so much more serious that, fearing that he might be cast into prison, he deemed it wiser to take the precaution of escape. He sought refuge in a convent at Rome belonging to his order, but finding that the suit against him was renewed and followed him to Rome, in 1576 he took the serious step of casting off his habit and abandoning the religious life. Taught by experience to dread discovery, he resumed his baptismal name of *Filippo*; and from this time forward we find him passing now under one name and now under another. He wandered about for some days until he arrived at Genoa, where he made a brief sojourn; thence to Noli, Piedmont, Turin, and other towns and cities of Italy, always supporting himself by teaching. In 1579 he

found himself at Geneva, where he sought employment as a corrector of proofs in one of the printing-houses, and seems to have fallen into some ill favour with the University of Geneva for having called the ministers of the Church *pedagogues*. We next find him at Lyons and Toulouse, and thence, in 1581, he travelled northwards to Paris. Here he met with better treatment than had previously been his lot. He was made "Professor Extraordinary," and became on terms of warm friendship with Henri III. Three books on the Art of Raymond Lully he published during this French sojourn. The *Candle-Bearer*, though probably written many years earlier, he also now published. In 1583 Bruno went to England, and the two years spent there seem to have been the happiest years of his adult life. He lived in the house of Castelnau de Mauvissière, and dedicated four of his works to him. Fulke Greville, Philip Sidney, and other men of learning and knightly worth were among his friends. In June of this year he was allowed to hold a public disputation before the Chancellor of Oxford upon the Copernican theory, but apparently there was little agreement between him and his audience, and he records with some bitterness that he hardly knows which ought to be condemned the most, the beer-drinking propensities of the undergraduates or the hopeless pedantry of their seniors.

The *Cena delle Ceneri* (Supper of Ashes), or Evening Conversations on Ash Wednesday, stands second in Wagner's edition of Bruno's Italian works, and is the first bearing a dedication to the French Ambassador, Castelnau de Mauvissière. It consists of five dialogues between Smitho an Englishman, Teofilo a philosopher (presumably Bruno himself), Prudenzio a pedant, and Frulla, a character introduced probably for diversion, whose chief employment consists in making jests that are more or less unseemly. These dialogues are concerned principally with two subjects: a lively description of his life in London, and an investigation into the Copernican theory, which Bruno cannot help feeling is strangely divergent from the Mosaic account of creation. He is careful, however, to point out that the philosophy of Copernicus is favoured in many passages of the Book of Job, for which book he had an immense admiration, describing it in his fourth dialogue as "one of the most singular that can be read, full of all good theology, physics, and morality, abounding with wisest discourses, which Moses added as a sacrament to the book of his Laws."

It is in the *Cena delle Ceneri* that Bruno first displays his true attitude towards Aristotelianism, and more especially towards that scholasticism which, while sheltering itself under the name of Aristotle, totally ignored the true method of the master himself. To understand Bruno's denunciation of Aristotelianism, we must remember that under the influence of scholasticism the great Stagirite had been endowed with an infallibility which assuredly he would not have

claimed for himself. The test of any new doctrine, any scientific discovery, was held to be found not in experiment, nor in argument, but in the support it might or might not receive from the works of Aristotle. Nay, the mere omission of reference in Aristotle to any subject was considered sufficient negative proof to condemn it, or at least to exclude it from all further investigation. And Bruno seemed at times to be excited to an absolute hatred to a philosophical bigotry and intolerance that threatened to impede all further knowledge as much as religious intolerance itself. There is an anecdote told, for instance, of a certain student who, having detected spots on the sun, communicated his discovery to a priest. "My son," replied the priest, "I have read Aristotle many times, and I can assure you that there is nothing of the kind mentioned by him. Go in peace, and learn to convince yourself that the spots which you have seen are in your own eyes, and not in the sun." This pseudo-Aristotelianism served indeed as a sort of convenient cloak to religious bigotry, for its scientific support was chiefly claimed as a verification of the Mosaic account of creation. Bruno had no wish unduly to decry Aristotle; but he did not disguise his opinion that reverence for him, and indeed for all authority, considered as mere authority, carried to a superstitious extent, must be a hindrance to all true progress; and in this *Cena*, endeavouring to relegate Aristotle to his true place in the history of thought, Bruno pointed to a fact that is even now hardly sufficiently recognized—viz., that what are called the *olden* ages, the *ancient* times, are in reality the *early* ages, the *youthful* times; and, conversely, that what are spoken of as the recent and modern times, are in reality the older. The world, for instance—now well-nigh on its twentieth century—is older by more than four hundred years than when Bruno pointed out this great truth; and he was led to the statement because he had been rebuked for his presumption in venturing to question the authority of one who had lived so many years earlier than himself as Aristotle, the inference drawn being that because Aristotle had lived so many years earlier, therefore must his opinion be of proportionately greater value. Bruno rightly perceived that the exact converse of this is the case; and though some of his works, taken as a whole, are finer than the *Cena delle Ceneri*, we doubt whether any of them contain a truth of greater value than where he thus relegates authority to its rightful place.

The *Della Causa, Principio et Uno* is a sort of continuation of, or at all events has a certain connection with, the *Cena delle Ceneri*. The scene is still laid in England, and Teofilo again forms the chief among the *dramatis personæ*. Smitho's place is filled by Dicsono Arelio; the pedant is called Poliinnio, while Gervasio is substituted for Frulla. It is dedicated to "Michel di Castelnau, Signor di Mauvissiero," the distinguished French Ambassador to England, Castelnau de la Mauvissière.

It is in the *Della Causa Principio et Uno* that Bruno's relationship to Spinoza is best to be seen.

"What is the efficient cause?" asks Dicsono.

"I affirm," answers Teofilo, "the physical universal efficient to be the universal intellect. This is that One which fills the great whole, which illuminates the universe, which directs Nature to produce its species in the way which is most suitable. This, I understand; to be that One in all things which produces diverse configurations and works out divers faculties."

"Will you distinguish what you mean by extrinsic cause and intrinsic cause?" asks Dicsono.

And in reply Teofilo defines his *causa intrinseca* and *causa extrinseca* very much as Spinoza his *Natura Naturans* and *Natura Naturata*, Nature acting and Nature acted on. Or, to use more modern phraseology, both would affirm the One Sole Cause and Principle of Things, to be the *noumenon*, of which the multiform modes of existence we see around us are but *phenomena*.

Yet the work most necessary for us to study in order to comprehend Bruno's exact place in modern science and philosophy is his *De l'Infinito Universo e Mondi*; and it is to an analysis of this work, therefore, that we purpose to devote most space.

We must bear in mind that in the latter half of the sixteenth century the Copernican theory was still in the freshness of novelty, and that it had come upon Bruno as a sort of revelation. It had more than a scientific value for him, though he would have been the last to under-estimate its scientific importance. But he was of a keenly imaginative bent, possessing that kind of imagination—what Wordsworth calls "the vision and the faculty divine"—which achieves discoveries by a sort of intuition. He pondered and brooded over this new revelation, this revulsion of thought, which relegated the earth from her position of sovereignty to that of helpless submission, from the place of ruler to ruled, till he seemed penetrated by it. He examined it in all its bearings, gathering with each examination increased consciousness of its importance, till suddenly, and as it were by a leap, its full significance burst upon him. What if this solar system of ours was but one system among myriads? What if the position our earth fills towards the sun was but the same as that sun himself fills in a still larger system? As with the Copernican theory, this new conception had for him more than a scientific value. It came as a sort of religion to his poetic impressionable soul, filling him with that mysterious consciousness of the Infinite as sublime as it is bewildering. And from thenceforth Bruno became the apostle of the Sidereal system. If the modern conception of the Solar system rightly bears the name of "Copernican," no less rightly, it seems to us, should the modern conception of the Sidereal system bear the name of "Bruncean," or possibly, as Bruno would have preferred the

nomenclature, the "Nolan" theory. Yet owing to some strange irony of fate, Copernicus, dying peaceably in his bed at an advanced age, unconscious it is true of his own future greatness, yet suffering few of the penalties of greatness, has been long associated with a distinctly new epoch in astronomical discovery. Bruno, on the contrary, who paid the penalty of his greatness by a long imprisonment and a cruel death, has been until lately almost ignored, and even now we rarely find him mentioned in any history of modern astronomy. Yet as much greater as is the discovery of the sidereal system than that of the solar system, so much greater, it seems to us, should Bruno be considered than Copernicus.

Yet Bruno, while possessed of a longing almost unsurpassed to penetrate the mystery of the universe that presses upon most thoughtful minds, was comparatively but little oppressed with what the Germans have called *Welt-Schmerz* (i.e., world-sorrow), or that consciousness of the burden and mystery of human suffering which has afflicted so many thinkers from the writer of Ecclesiastes to Schopenhauer and Leopardi. And in this as in other ways he shows himself to be a child of his own period. In the sixteenth century man himself had not come to be regarded as the proper study of man, but rather the place on which he dwelt, its relationship to the sun, and finally the position filled by it in space. Consequently, it was the infinite glory of the universe that filled the mind of Bruno; the consideration of the majesty and omniscience of the One Sole Cause of all things that animated him till he was raised, as it were, above the contemplation of earthly things, and seemed hardly in touch with humanity. Whosoever he did descend from this high pedestal, it was in a mood that was slighter and altogether less worthy. The pedantries and stupidities of his contemporaries were derided by him with light banter, sometimes with scathing satire, but too often conched in language according with the coarse taste of the day. All his nobler, all his more fervent, thoughts were given to the contemplation of things celestial. In this wise he fully deserved with Spinoza the name of "God-intoxicated." The whence and how of the Cosmos in all its unrealizable grandeur penetrated him with a sort of irresistible fascination, but the why and wherefore of sin and misery but little disturbed him; nor does he seem to have asked himself how the superstitions he so contemptuously derided should have been allowed to take root and flourish. This is the more remarkable, because Bruno was no ascetic; still less cynical or morose. He was bright-hearted and, we should judge, eminently lovable—at once grateful for kindness and appreciative of goodness; and therefore to a certain extent must have belonged to that order of mind called sympathetic. Yet that indignation against wrong-doing, that yearning and compassion called out by suffering almost inseparable from sympathetic natures, he

seems to have felt but little. And the interpretation is, we think, that he gave to humanity but his passing moods ; to Divine Wisdom his soul and passion. We use the word *passion* advisedly, because Bruno was very fond of comparing his passion for wisdom with that of the lover's yearning for his mistress.

The *Infinito Universo e Mondi* was dedicated to Castelnau, in a somewhat lengthy preface descriptive of his book, which has been translated by Toland ; though of the work itself, so far as we are aware, there is no English translation as yet.

Bruno commences his preface by complaining of the treatment bestowed upon him for his devotion to the study of Nature, for the contempt he feels towards popular authority, and for his love towards "one particular lady. It is for her that I am free in servitude, content in pain, rich in necessity, and alive in death. Hence it is even from my passion for this beauty that, as being weary, I draw not back my feet from the difficult road, nor, as bewildered, divert my gaze from the divine object. . . . If I err, I am far from thinking I do ; and whether I speak or write, I dispute not for victory (for I look upon all reputation and conquest to be hateful to God, to be vile and dishonourable without truth), but it is for the love of true wisdom, and by the studious admiration of this mistress, that I fatigue and torment myself." Then, after describing the leading arguments in his book, he breaks forth into a rapturous eulogy upon the new point of view it presents to the reader, comparing it with the old received notion of the position of the earth, thus : "This is that philosophy which opens the senses, which enlarges the understanding, and satisfies the mind. Look to it now, gentlemen astrologers, with your humble servants the natural philosophers, and see to what use you can put your circles that are described by the imaginary nine movable spheres, in which you so imprison your brains that you seem to me like so many parrots in their cages, hopping and dancing from one perch to another, yet always winding and turning within the same wires. But be it known unto you that so great an emperor hath not so narrow a palace, or so low a tribunal, but rather an infinite representation of an infinite original, and a spectacle befitting the excellency and eminence of Him that can neither be imagined, nor conceived, nor comprehended. Thus the excellency of God is magnified and the grandeur of His empire made manifest, since He is glorified not in one, but in numberless suns ; not in one earth or world, but in ten hundred thousand, in infinite globes." The conclusion of this dedication shows Bruno to be fully conscious of the importance of his work, and of himself as its writer, notwithstanding the little recognition he has as yet received ; and he bids Castelnau look upon him as one "whom you are not to entertain among your domestics as having need of him, but as a person having need of you

for so many and great purposes as you here see. Consider that for having such numbers at hand bound to serve you, you are thereby nothing different from farmers, bankers, or merchants; but, that for having a man deserving to be by you encouraged, protected, and assisted, you are in reality (what you have always shown yourself to be) like unto magnanimous princes, heroes, and gods, who have ordained such as you for the defence of their friends."

The *Infinito Universo e Mondi* consists of five dialogues, the *dramatis personæ* being Elpino, an upholder of Aristotle's opinions; Filoteo, occasionally called Teofilo, evidently Bruno himself; and two minor personages, introduced more or less for the sake of diversion. In the fifth dialogue a new character is introduced, who is called Albertino, and who is represented as one having sufficient ability and freedom from prejudice to understand the new conception of the universe, notwithstanding that by education he is an Aristotelian.

The first dialogue is chiefly devoted to a dissertation on the unreliability of the senses, Bruno asserting that it is only by careful comparison of one object with another that even a proximate knowledge can be attained. From this he proceeds to the question of the infinity of the universe, and in clear, concise language, almost worthy of Herbert Spencer himself, shows what Mr. Spencer has so ably demonstrated in his *First Principles*, that a finite universe is a contradiction in terms. By no manner of possibility are we able to conceive the universe bounded by nothing. It is true that to our finite intellect an infinite universe is also incapable of clear presentation to our thoughts, but (as it seems to us) the difference between these two difficulties is one not of degree, but of kind. The one difficulty is simply that the finite cannot grasp the Infinite; the other involves what any finite mind, if he will but rightly consider, must see to be a glaring contradiction in itself. Finite means *bounded*, and bounded implies bounded by *something*, and thus by no possibility can we conceive space bounded; for that by which space is bounded must itself lie in space. In clear, precise language Bruno shows that we are perfectly able to conceive finite globes, but not finite space: "Io dico l'universo tutto infinito, per che non ha margine, termine, nè superficie; dico, l'universo non essere totalmente infinito, per che ciascuna parte, che di quello possiamo prendere, è finita, e de' mondi innumerabili, che contiene, ciascuno è finito. Io dico Dio tutto infinito, per che da sè esclude ogni termine, et ogni suo attributo e Uno et Infinito; e dico Dio totalmente infinito, per che tutto lui è in tutto il mondo et in ciascuna sua parte infinitamente e totalmente: al contrario de l'infinità de l'universo, la quale è totalmente in tutto, e non in queste parti, se pur, riferendosi a l'infinito, possono esser chiamate parti, che noi possiamo comprendere in quello."

From the consideration of an infinite universe Bruno proceeds to the scientific conception of infinite motion. Each world he main-

tains to be in unceasing motion; this motion is intrinsic, and proceeds from no external pressure, yet he thinks that there must be an infinite power acting throughout the entire universe at once both "extensively and intensively."

The same subject is continued in the second dialogue, and very many of the same arguments; but Bruno imports into this dialogue a discussion upon the proof of the infinity of the universe afforded by gravity and levity; Elpino repeating all the arguments of Aristotle, while Fileteo examines and refutes them.

The third dialogue deals with the shape and figure of the spheres and the number and diversity of the heavens, Bruno declaring that, so far from "Heaven," being one, there are an infinite number of "heavens," taking that word in its usual signification; for as this earth has its heaven, which is that region of space wherein it moves and performs its course, so has each and every other of the innumerable worlds in the universe its own particular heaven. In one sense only can we affirm heaven to be one, and that is, as being the general space which contains infinite worlds. Then he shows that every star has its own particular motion. He explains the difference between stars or suns, and planets, and shows that the former have light in themselves, and the latter but reflected light. He examines also the doctrine of Cusanus about the probability of these other worlds being inhabited, inclining to such a belief himself. The fourth dialogue repeats what has been said in former dialogues as to the infinity of worlds, their formation and motion, and a further explanation is given of gravity and levity. How thoroughly Bruno grasped and realized the office, so omnipresent and unceasing, that gravity fills throughout the entire universe, from the hugest system of stars to the smallest object, is shown by his apt illustration of a stone, which, he argues, were it placed between two worlds of equal size, and at an exactly similar distance from each, would remain motionless, being equally balanced in space by the gravity that in equal proportions belongs to each world. He shows that there are worlds of all sizes, and systems of various degrees of complexity; that the universe has "no margin, no extremity;" and that therefore, though each globe has its own centre, and has a relation to the common centre of the whole, we cannot discover a centre in a universe which is infinite. Indeed, he might with perfect justice in support of his position have described his conception of the universe in that fine phrase familiar to most of us as "having its circumference nowhere and its centre everywhere." In this dialogue he also touches upon the nature of comets, which he seems to think has a certain resemblance to that of planets.

The fifth dialogue is principally devoted to twelve objections, which Albertino, the new interlocutor, brings to Bruno's doctrine of the plurality of worlds. Bruno's conviction of the greater sublimity

of his own conception of the Cosmos, is best to be seen in the preface to his *Infinito Universo e Mondi*, to which we have already alluded. We will quote the following passages from it because they will serve to show not only his ardour and enthusiasm for this new conception, but also the singular extent to which he seemed elevated by it from all touch with human hopes and fears:—

“These are the doubts and motives, the solution of which we have said enough to expose the intimate and radical errors of the common philosophy, and to show the weight and importance of our own. Here you will learn the reason why we should not fear that any part of this universe should fall or fly off, that the least particle should be lost in empty space, or be truly annihilated. Here you will find the reason of the vicissitude and mutation of all things, whereby nothing is really ill that befalls from which we may not escape, nor good to which we cannot run; since in this infinite field, in spite of this constant mutation, the substance itself remains ever the same. From this contemplation, if we will but duly observe, it will follow that no unexpected accident, whether of grief or pain, should disturb us, nor any hope nor good fortune unduly elate us, whence we shall have the true way to perfect morality and thus may become great enough to be able to despise such things as are greatly esteemed by men of small or childish minds, and to be able to work out for themselves the divine laws engraven upon our hearts. For we shall know that it is no more difficult to fly from hence up to heaven than to fly from heaven back again to earth, since ascending thither and descending hither are all one. For we are no more surrounded by other globes than they are by our globe, nor are they more central to us than we to them; neither do they press upon the stars more than we, as they no less than we are comprehended by the same sky. Behold us then free from envy! Behold us delivered from the vain anxiety and foolish care of desiring to enjoy that good afar off which we may possess close at hand and near. Behold us freed from that greater terror that they should fall upon us any more than we should hope that we might fall upon them, since our globe, like the others, is sustained by the same infinite ether (*aria*); thus this our animal (*animale*¹) freely runs through that part of space confined to his own region, as the other planets do to theirs. Did we but consider and comprehend all this, oh! to what greater consideration and comprehension might we not be carried! since by means of this science we should be sure to obtain happiness, which in other sciences is sought after in vain.

“This is that philosophy . . . which leads man to the only true beatitude possible to him as man, for it delivers him from solicitous pursuit of pleasure and blind dread of misery, bidding him

¹ Bruno frequently describes worlds as if he considered them to be animated beings; the larger he calls *divinities*, the smaller *animals*.

enjoy the present, neither to dread nor to look forward with hope to the future, since that same Providence or Fate or Fortune which causes all vicissitudes that befall us, will let us know no more of the one than of the other, though at first sight it is natural to feel doubtful and perplexed. Yet if we will consider carefully the substance and being of that into which we are mutable, we shall find that there is no death attending us, nor any other real substance, since nothing is substantially diminished; but everything as it courses through infinite space, simply changes its form. Thus everything being subjected to a good and most efficient cause, we should believe and hope that as everything proceeds from good, so must the whole be good, and for a good purpose. The contrary appears only to those who apprehend but the present, as the beauty of an edifice is not manifest to one that sees but a small portion, as a stone, or plastering, or part of a wall; but appears great to him who sees the whole and has leisure to make himself familiar with every part. We fear not therefore that what is accumulated in this world, by the vehemence of some wandering spirit, or the wrath of some thundering Jove, should be dispersed from this tomb or cupola of the sky, or be dissolved into powder beyond the starry firmament; nor that the nature of things can otherwise come to be annihilated in substance, than as it seems to our eyes that the air contained in the cavity of a bubble becomes nothing when it bursts; because we know that in a world in which everything succeeds another, there is no profoundest depth into which, as by the hand of an artificer, things are dissolved irreparably into nothing. There are no ends, limits, margins, or walls that defraud or subtract the infinite abundance of things. Thus the earth is fertile, and so is the sea; thus the perpetual brightness of the sun; eternal fuel sustaining those devouring fires, and moisture the exhausted seas, from the infinite and ever renewed sustaining matter. Thus Democritus and Epicurus, who asserted the infinity of things, renewing and restoring, were nearer to a right conception than those who imagined the reverse." The Introduction concludes with a fine sonnet, from which we have not space to quote here.

We have dealt at some length upon the *Infinito Universo e Mondi*, because of all Bruno's Italian works it best shows how far he anticipated modern science. The Latin works, *De Monade*, *De Immenso*, are substantially a reproduction of *Della Causa* and *Della Infinito*, not merely repeating the same philosophical and scientific conceptions, but portraying the same condition of mind to which we have already alluded: an intense mystical rapture which raises him entirely above fear of death or earthly misfortune, and makes us feel that the subjective happiness within him must almost have atoned for the strokes of his untoward fortune. His relationship to Leibnitz is best seen in his work, *De Monade*.

We need not dwell at any length upon the two works of Bruno, next in order in Wagner's edition, *Spaccio de la Bestia Trionfante* and the *Cabala del Cavallo Pegaseo*, the first of which is an extremely able though somewhat heavy allegory, written in the style of the period. It is dedicated to Sidney, and satirizes the various vices of the day under the guise of astronomical personifications. The *Cavallo* satirizes that piety which refuses all honest inquiry and original investigation. To the *Cavallo* is added, as a sort of continuation, a very short work of only five pages, called *Asino Cillenico*. Indeed the "ass," as a representation of human stupidity, was a favourite metaphor with Bruno, and meets us in many of his works. The next and last work in Wagner's edition, is that called *Gli Eroici Furori*—a work of much beauty, and interesting to us not so much for any philosophical or scientific conception it puts forth, but rather as an autobiographical revelation descriptive of that mystical rapture to which we have already alluded.

The *Eroici Furori* is dedicated to Philip Sidney in a somewhat lengthy preface, in which Bruno draws a comparison between the attractions of sensual love and those of the divine Muse which enchains himself. At the end of the preface, as if moved by some compunction lest he may have spoken too contemptuously of women, there is a sonnet written in praise of the beautiful and virtuous women he met with while in England. The work itself is in two parts, each part being divided into five dialogues.¹ It is freely interspersed with numerous sonnets, opening with one invoking his muse to come to his aid and inspire him with all high thoughts. Many of these sonnets are of extreme beauty. *Eroici Furori*, or Heroic Love, really means with Bruno an intense longing for divine wisdom and love for spiritual beauty. And it is impossible to read the sonnets of which this work is so largely composed without apprehending the sublime inward vision by which he is inspired. He conceives himself freed from the trammels of the flesh, unclogged even by the power of gravity, breasting the air at will; bounding through space from world to world, from system to system, gaining with each progress fuller knowledge of the One Sole Cause of All. For if Infinite Space is illimitable, Infinite Being must surely be without limits also. His religious standpoint was, therefore, distinctly pantheism. It is sometimes said that there is but a step between atheism and pantheism, and logically perhaps this is so; but emotionally the difference is immense, and religious feeling pertains to the emotion. The atheist believes that there is no God but Nature; the pantheist conceives the whole of Nature to be but a manifestation of God. No one can read this *Eroici Furori* without seeing that it is a work distinctly of religious aspiration. Nay, if

¹ The first part has been translated into English by L. Williams, under the title of *The Heroic Enthusiasts*.

we except such of his writings as are satires we may describe all Bruno's works to be of this nature. His spiritual ideal and divine object receives, it is true, different names at different times. Now she is "Sophia or Wisdom," now his "one beloved lady," now "mia diva;" but through all her various guises we are made to feel with Bruno himself that all these attempts at nomenclature are but provisional and inadequate definitions of that which is beyond human conception, much less human definition.

We have sometimes thought that in their essential natures the poet Shelley has more in common with Bruno than any other writer with whom we are acquainted. In each there is the same spiritual exaltation, the same intensity of religious feeling, strangely contrasted with absence of belief in religious dogma; there is the same hatred of shams and hypocrisy; the same passionate ardour for truth; there is even the same contempt for pedagogues, and dislike to university life. But in Shelley was developed a far larger amount of feeling for the woes and sins of humanity, which makes him at once greater and lesser than Bruno. It made his teaching too iconoclastic and destructive, while that of Bruno was mainly constructive. Shelley warred against all religion, Bruno against the shams and make-believes of religion. Shelley hated both legal and religious restraint, all that interfered with the freedom, and, as he thought, happiness of man. Bruno only wanted sufficient freedom to worship in his own way the divine Mistress which enchained him; in the service of whom and in the proclamation of whose beauty he could be as iconoclastic as Shelley himself; and for her he was ready to sacrifice both life and liberty. But all religion that was honestly held—so long as it interfered not with a belief in the infinity of worlds—had nothing but consideration from him. He declares that though there is but one Truth, there are many ways leading to that one Truth. And consistently with this declaration he was on terms of warm affection with the Catholic Castelnau, equally with the Protestant Sidney. He was one of the very few in his day capable of admiring persons of an alien religion, so long only as that religion was honestly held. Thus intellectually he dissented more from the Lutheran doctrine than any other, because of the preference it professed for faith rather than works, declaring that such a doctrine partook of the nature of *deform* rather than *reform*; yet for the Lutherans, considered as a body, he had much respect, simply because he could see that they were genuine in their beliefs. Thus where Shelley would probably have held that religion was made for man and not man for religion, and that all religions were only to be considered good in so far as they made man better, Bruno held that the worship of the Infinite One should be a supreme object with man, and in his *Expulsion of the Triumphant Beast* he traces the resemblance that there is in all religions, and shows that beneath

superficial diversities the aim and object of all is essentially the same—viz., the contemplation and worship of the Ineffable. Thus, the improvement of man was to Shelley what the adoration of God was to Bruno; yet even here Bruno so far agrees with Shelley that in his *Spaccio* and elsewhere he pronounces those laws to be best, whether secular or religious, that give to the best actions the best encouragement. The slight difference between them lies not so much in the essential natures of the two men as in the different periods in which each was born. The *Zeit-Geist* of Bruno's day was the new revelation of the solar system and of the movement and position of the earth. Humanity, its rights and duties and privileges, filled the foremost place of thought in the time of Shelley; and it was natural that, living when he did, the woes and miseries of mankind should have pressed themselves upon him so acutely. Yet in spite of this diversity of aims, we can scarcely read the works of the two poets consecutively and with care without perceiving the very real similarity there is between them. Let him who has just risen from a study of Bruno's *Infinito Universo e Mondi* begin the *Adonais* of Shelley, or his *Alastor*, and he will see that the spiritual conception in each is almost identical. Or let him study certain of the sonnets in the *Eroici Furori*, and fully realize Bruno's imaginative representation of himself, freed from all earthly trammels, breasting space and absorbed in the contemplation of the Infinite around him, and then read *Queen Mab*, whom Shelley represents as led by a Fairy or Spirit, seated in a wondrous chariot, which seemed to fly

“Through the midst of an immense concave
Radiant with million constellations, tinged
With shades of infinite colour,
And semi-circled with a belt,
Flashing incessant meteors.

* * * *

“The magic car moved on,
Earth's distant orb appeared
The smallest light that twinkles in the heaven;
While round the chariot's way
Innumerable systems widely rolled,
And countless spheres diffused
An ever varying glory?

* * * *

“Spirit of Nature! here,
In this interminable wilderness
Of worlds, at whose immensity
Even soaring fancy staggers—
Here is thy fitting temple.
Yet not the lightest leaf
That quivers to the passing breeze
Is less instinct with thee;
Yet not the meanest worm
That lurks in graves and fattens on the dead
Less shares thy eternal breath.

Spirit of Nature ! thou !
Imperishable as this scene,
Here is thy fitting temple."

No one, we think, could read the works of the two poets even superficially without seeing the very real resemblance in the spirit pervading them ; no one could read a little more deeply without perceiving also the difference engrafted on the similarity by the spirit of the time. It is enough for Bruno to hope that infinite worlds are filled with inhabitants capable of worshipping the Ineffable. Shelley dreads lest these inhabitants may suffer from the woes and sorrows that afflict humanity.

We must return from this digression to that point where we last left off in our sketch of Bruno's travels.

In 1585 Bruno left England for a second visit to Paris ; thence to Mayence, Marburg, and Wittenberg. He received better treatment in Wittenberg than in his other resting-places, and consequently remained there two years. On March 8, 1588, he pronounced a grateful valedictory oration before the University of Wittenberg ; unfortunately too long for quotation here. From Wittenberg he went to Prague ; thence to Helmstedt, where he met with a fate now almost habitual to him—viz., attracting warm admiration and favour from the reigning princes, while incurring virulence from the theologians and pedagogues. Boethius, the Pastor of the Evangelical Church, solemnly excommunicated him.

Frankfort was Bruno's next resting-place. It was the centre of the German book trade ; and Italian booksellers, and indeed booksellers from various parts of Europe, attended the Easter and Michaelmas fairs held at Frankfort. Bruno would have liked to find a lodging in the house of the great printer, Wechel ; but he was gradually becoming a marked character, and Wechel evidently feared to run the risk of sheltering him. Somewhat strangely he found ready admission in the convent of the Carmelites. It was here in Frankfort that Bruno sent his four Latin works, *On the Threefold Minimum*, *On the Monad*, *On Immensity*, and *On the Composition of Images, Signs and Ideas*, to press. Early in 1591 Bruno suddenly left Frankfort, and had the imprudence to revisit Italy. His country had always been warmly beloved by him, and he was probably only too glad to avail himself of a slight incident as an excuse for revisiting it. This incident was nothing more important than the fact that a book written by him—possibly a work alluding to the art of Lully—had fallen into the hands of Ciotto, a somewhat eminent Venetian bookseller, who had shown it to a young Italian nobleman belonging to the distinguished family of the Mocenigos. Giovanni or Zuane Mocenigo shared to a certain extent the love of learning common to his family, and probably possessed also the love of the marvellous, and a leaning to the occult so prevalent in his age. A

glance at the book seems to have inspired him with the hope that Bruno would be able to impart to him much that he was desirous to learn; and Bruno received in consequence the flattering intimation that Mocenigo was anxious to become acquainted with him. Still, this little incident, though it probably formed an additional reason for Bruno's sudden departure from Frankfort, could scarcely have been the true cause, since he was eight months on his road—staying at Zurich and Padua—before visiting Venice. From the moment that he entered Venice fate was preparing her toils for him. He first took a lodging, so as to instruct Mocenigo, though he still frequently returned to Padua in order to give private lessons to certain German students residing at the University. Then in March, 1592, he became an intimate of Mocenigo's house on the Grand Canal. From that time his fate was sealed. Mocenigo became at first disappointed, and afterwards irritated, that Bruno did not impart that occult knowledge so ardently desired by him. Bruno very probably, with his known imprudence, did not disguise the contempt he felt towards the superstitions and pedantries of his age. Then Mocenigo, unable to divest himself of his preconceived conception of Bruno's acquaintance with occult matters, threatened him with the Inquisition if he would not impart what Mocenigo still thought he was only keeping back from some motives of his own. Bruno answered contemptuously that he "had no fear of the Inquisition; yet, as he seemed to be giving no satisfaction to his patron, he was quite willing to pack up his things and leave." While the unfortunate Neapolitan was preparing for his departure, his patron, probably dreading that Bruno might spread abroad more of his superstitious feelings than he cared to have publicly made known, secretly betrayed him to the Inquisition. His denunciations are in the form of three letters, too lengthy to be given here; but they will be found in Berti's *Documenti intorno a Giordano Bruno*,¹ and they are dated severally May 23, 25, and 29, 1592. In them Mocenigo accuses Bruno of being possessed of the devil, of being an enemy to Christ, and of various philosophical and heretical opinions, some of which he probably held, but the majority of which were undoubtedly perversions. Thus, where he makes Bruno lament that "the Church in these days does not deal with men as the Apostles dealt, for they converted the people by preaching and good example, but now the Catholic Church takes men by violence and not by love," Mocenigo was probably quite accurate in his statement. Again, when he represents Bruno as holding the Catholic faith to be higher than all other forms of dogmatic beliefs, he is again probably correct. Bruno did not hold very strongly to any stated form of faith, thinking that a good life was of far more importance than any mere set of

¹ An English translation is given in the recent *Life of Bruno*, by I. Frith, published in Trübner's *Philosophical Series*, pp. 262-265.

doctrines; yet he never entirely shook himself free from a certain affection towards the religion long endeared to him by ancestry and the environment of his childhood, unsparing though he was towards the hypocrisies of the religious world during his later life. But when Mocenigo represented Bruno as denouncing Christ as *un tristo*, a sorry or contemptible fellow, assuredly he accused him of opinions which he never uttered, and which he indignantly repudiated.

On the 24th of May Bruno was conveyed to the prisons of the Holy Office, and on the following day Mocenigo took his oath of confirmation before the Father Inquisitor. The trial at once began. Ciotto and another Venetian bookseller, Bertano, were both examined, the one on the 26th, the other on the 29th of May. Both agreed in saying that Bruno had never uttered a word in their presence against Christianity or the Catholic Church. Then Bruno himself was examined, detailing at length the circumstances of his life. When asked the question, "What things are necessary to salvation?" he answered emphatically, "Faith, hope, and charity." Asked if he had any enemy, he replied bitterly, "My only enemy is Ser Giovanni Mocenigo, who threatened my life and my honour, and that continually." Yet it is probable that the numerous onslaughts made by Bruno upon pedagogues and theologians in different parts of Europe, together with his praise of various Lutheran sovereigns, may, unconsciously to himself, have brought him many enemies. On the 23rd of June Andrea Morosini, the distinguished historian, was called upon to give his evidence. Bruno had been in the habit of attending his literary and political assemblies. Upon being asked his opinion of Bruno's religious belief, Morosini answered that in his hearing Bruno had never touched upon religion, and added that had he thought him other than a good Catholic he would never have permitted him to enter his assemblies.

Etiquette between Venice and Rome caused a certain delay in Bruno's trial, but on the 7th January 1593, he was officially delivered over to the Inquisition at Rome, and on the 27th entered those gloomy prisons in which the seven remaining years of his life were to be spent. From the beginning of 1593 to the beginning of 1599 Bruno was kept in suspense from day to day, not knowing when sentence was to be delivered. It is difficult at first sight to account for a delay so unnecessary, and which must have added so greatly to his punishment, but probably indecision on the part of the Pope, and not pure cruelty, lay at the root of it. It was not easy for the Inquisition to point to any particular action or written opinion that would justify it in executing Bruno. Such satires and invectives as appeared in some of his less worthy writings he was perfectly willing to recant, frankly regretting that he should have written them. All his nobler and more important works he declares, and with evident sincerity, to be free from the faintest imputation

upon the Church.¹ But the Inquisition was probably more logical than Bruno in perceiving that, if his opinions once found acceptance, some of the most important doctrines of the Church would be in danger. Thus, the Copernican doctrine, of which he was so fervent an apostle, was certainly against the Mosaic account of creation, though, as Bruno pointed out, it was favoured by the Book of Job. Again, his doctrine of the mutability of all things, their transformation, the unity that underlies variety, the majesty and harmony of eternal law, may, as he avers, find support in the writer of Ecclesiastes, but they are certainly against miraculous interpositions and the intercessions of saints. Yet it was indirectly rather than directly that the real danger of Bruno's works lay. Explicitly and implicitly he had attacked all superstitious worship of authority. And authority was the life-blood of the Church. He was no blatant iconoclast wishing to hew down all that was sacred with time. But he lived in an age when reverence for mere authority choked all higher reverence, even that for truth itself; when it acted as a putrefying influence, contaminating innocuous things; while it rendered that which was essentially corrupt of tenfold greater corruption.

We who are living in an age which is reaping the fruits of Bruno's teaching can hardly realize how insidious and widespread was this worship of authority. Yet, in our opinion, Bruno's claim to be remembered by posterity lies not so much in the scientific discoveries he helped to effect, great as these were, as in his courage to proclaim them. He was one of the very few in his day to perceive that a question can only be judged on its own merits, and that it is impossible to arrive at those merits without free and untrammelled discussion. Yet it was just this freedom of discussion that the Church had always forbidden. And, though she took seven years to arrive at the decision, she was probably only showing her customary astuteness in judging that Bruno's writings, innocent as the author himself judged them to be, must prove a source of real danger to her.

At intervals during the year 1599 attempts were made by the Inquisition to induce Bruno to recant, but he answered that he had nothing more to recant, nor knew he what he should recant. On the 8th, or according to some authorities on the 9th, of February, 1600, he was conducted from his prison to the presence of his judges to hear his sentence pronounced while he was made to kneel. After being degraded as an impenitent heretic, he was sentenced to be burnt alive. He only answered, "It may be that you are more afraid to deliver this judgment than I to receive it." On the 17th of February, clad in a *san benito*, on which flames and devils were

¹ That Bruno had doubts upon some of the tenets of the Church, such as the doctrine of the Trinity, seems certain. But (to use his own words) when thus expressing himself he wrote "as a philosopher, not as a theologian:" a mode of defence less alien to the conscience of that period than it would be to our own. In his nobler works, however, he seldom touched upon doctrinal matters.

painted, he was led to the stake in the Campo dei Fiori. A crucifix was offered him; he refused to look upon it. It might be that his long imprisonment and his cruel sentence had had the effect of exciting in him an antipathy to the Catholic Church that he had not previously felt. Then the pile was set alight. It is recorded by an eye-witness that he did not utter a cry. His ashes were collected, and soon all that was mortal of Giordano Bruno was scattered to the winds.

As there has been an attempt of late to cast doubts upon the fact of Bruno's execution—an attempt not simply confined to the Catholic party, but that has even found its way into so useful a publication as the new edition of *Chambers's Encyclopædia*—we think it well to relate the various proofs there are which seem to us to make Bruno's execution as much a matter of certainty as any historical fact not within actual human memory can be. The proofs are as follows:—

1. A letter from Scioppius giving a full and detailed account of the execution of Bruno, which took place in the presence of Scioppius himself on the 17th of February, 1600. This letter, it must be admitted, was not published till 1620, but still Scioppius did not die for some time after that date, and a forgerer would hardly have dared to circulate a letter written by him and bearing his name, if not genuine, during his lifetime.¹

2. Mersenne, in his book called *Impiété des Deistes*, printed in 1624, speaks of Bruno as “un athée brûlé en Italie.”

3. Wachter, the Imperial ambassador at Rome 1600, mentioned the fact of Bruno's death to Kepler. (See Correspondence of Kepler and Brengger, first printed in 1858.)

4. The *Avvisi di Roma*, contained in the manuscripts of the Vatican (a sort of newspaper of those days), of the 19th of February 1600, records Bruno's execution as having taken place on the previous Thursday, the 17th.

5. The *Archives of San Giovanni Decollato*, containing a notice of the execution in all its details. The day of the week is said to be Thursday, the year 1600; but the day of the month is erroneously stated to be the 16th instead of the 17th, as it should be.

C. E. PLUMPTRE.

¹ In the October number of *Macmillan's Magazine*, 1885, Mr. R. C. Christie has stated at length the numerous proofs there are in support of the genuineness of this letter.

A FRENCH VIEW OF THE IRISH QUESTION.¹

MR. GLADSTONE has often declared that the opinion of the civilized world is in favour of his Irish policy, and, though this assertion has been often sneered at, it cannot be said that any serious attempt has been made to overthrow it by argument. Most of his opponents, indeed, would seem to admit that the general current of opinion in other countries goes to support Ireland's demands for self-government, only they contend that these views are unworthy of notice as proceeding from jealousy of England or other discreditable motives. The almost unanimous verdict of the American people on this subject is contemptuously put out of court as arising merely from a desire to conciliate the Irish vote.

The same cannot be said with regard to French opinion, but here it is contended that the past history of the relations between France and Ireland furnishes a sufficient reason why a Frenchman should instinctively take the Irish side. Hence the work before us might be summarily set aside by Unionists as being in its nature prejudiced, but that it is written, not only by a Frenchman, but by a French Protestant, and the son of a leading Protestant theologian. And, whatever prepossessions an ordinary Frenchman may have in favour of Ireland, those of a French Protestant are likely to be even stronger on the opposite side.

We must remember that Huguenot exiles had a distinguished share in the victory of the Boyne and the conquest of Ireland under William III., and that exiled Irish Catholics helped to dragoon the Huguenots of France. It is not surprising, therefore, that M. de Pressensé tells us that he commenced his studies in Irish history with a strong opinion in favour of the English Government, and the fact that he has ended by becoming a decided advocate of Home Rule must be ascribed to the genuine force of conviction.

Our author deals, in the first section of his book, with the history of the Act of Union, and he strongly expresses the opinion (which, it must be said, is that of all writers with any pretensions to impartiality) that the measure was carried by base and corrupt means. He passes some just and severe criticisms on the attempt of Mr. Ingram

¹ *L'Irlande et l'Angleterre depuis l'acte de l'Union jusqu'à nos jours.* Par Francis de Pressensé.

to rehabilitate this disgraceful transaction. In the following passage he answers very effectively the only plausible argument which has been advanced to show that the purchase of boroughs did not constitute a corrupt bargain. "Mr. Ingram makes a great deal of the fact that, of this sum, £400,000 were bestowed on the adversaries of the Union. I confess that I cannot well understand his argument. Does he maintain that the £700,000 received by the partisans of the Union did not contribute to form the majority in favour of that measure? Does he suppose that it would have been morally and politically possible to reserve the compensation for the partisans and to refuse it to the opponents of the Union? How is it that he does not see that the general principle of compensation was a corrupt one, and that, once admitted, it offered an almost irresistible temptation to feeble consciences and base minds to prefer their private interests to those of the country, and that it was an inevitable consequence that those of the opposition who happened to be proprietors of boroughs should share in the reward which had not been able to seduce them from their duty."

After a detailed history of the struggle for Catholic emancipation, M. de Pressensé passes on to what, before the inauguration of Mr. Gladstone's Irish policy, was the most honourable period in the history of the relations of the two countries, the alliance between O'Connell and the Whig Ministry of Lord Melbourne. It is only beginning to be recognized after the lapse of half a century how great a chance there was at this time of reconciling Ireland to the Union, which there is every reason to believe would have been realized if the English people had been wise and just, and had not overthrown the Melbourne Government in obedience to the dictates of Orange bigotry. Our author thus gives his judgment on this portion of Irish history. "The accession to power of Lord Melbourne had brought about a remarkable change. O'Connell had contented himself with satisfaction on points of principle, he had nobly effaced his personality, he had charitably interpreted the good intentions of the Ministry, even though the circumstances did not always allow them to be realized, he had been at London and at Dublin one of the principal supporters of the Government. The generous and liberal administration of Drummond had for the first time gained for the law and its representatives the love and confidence of the people. Order and peace had never reigned as fully in Ireland as during this too brief period. The supremely impolitic conduct of the House of Lords, in mutilating or rejecting the reforming proposals of the Ministry, had not succeeded in again arousing the spirit of resentment and defiance in the sister isle. For the first time peace had been established between the two countries by means of justice, and it may be affirmed that it was still easy to cement the Union, established on paper in 1800, by the union of hearts and desires." M.

de Pressensé proceeds to treat of the reactionary Irish policy of Sir Robert Peel, the famine of 1847, the Fenian movement, and the disestablishment of the Irish Church. His remarks on all these points show careful study of the subject and will well repay perusal ; but to the majority of readers the most interesting section of his book is likely to be the last part, in which he deals with the movement headed by Mr. Parnell and with Mr. Gladstone's adoption of the policy of Home Rule. He begins this portion of his work with a sketch of the movement headed by Mr. Butt, and explains clearly the causes of its failure as consisting partly in the character of the leader and partly in the heterogeneous nature of his party. "Mr. Butt, unfortunately, found himself in a position difficult enough for the chief of an independent section. He had undoubtedly resolution enough to forget that he had for a long time sat in the ranks of the Tory party. He triumphed most often over instincts and habits deeply rooted in him, in spite of the great transformation of his views on the Irish national question, and which led him, in purely English questions, to give the aid of his vote, and sometimes, even, of his voice, to his old comrades. His party did not always follow him in this path of voluntary isolation. The circumstances of its formation, even, were opposed to any strict discipline. Surprised, like everybody else, by the unexpected dissolution of 1874, Mr. Butt had been forced to accept as candidates persons of widely different antecedents. By the side of new comers, sincerely and entirely patriotic, he had been obliged to enrol some recruits whose fidelity was at least doubtful. Whigs like Sir Patrick O'Brien, fossil Tories like Sir George Bowyer and Colonel King-Harman, had pronounced with their lips the shibboleth of Home Rule, in order to make the gates of the House of Commons open to them. Once in the promised land, they forgot their promises to the electors, and gravitated towards the region where their real sympathies drew them, and where rewards from the Ministry or flatteries from the Opposition awaited them."

A party so composed could not fail to break up sooner or later, and, as our author shows very forcibly, Mr. Parnell came at a very opportune moment, when there was considerable danger of a return to revolutionary practices among the more ardent Nationalists, to point out a more successful mode of Parliamentary tactics than that of Mr. Butt's full dress debate on Home Rule once a year.

No writer in this country has seen more clearly than M. de Pressensé the reasons which induced the present Nationalist leader to resort to the much reviled policy of obstruction, and those who are in the habit of speaking of his tactics with nothing but scolding abuse would do well to consider this exposition of Mr. Parnell's motives. "He perceived that he must demonstrate to minds insensible to arguments grounded on the question of right, that the facts of the

case—the brutal facts under which his country had so long bent her head—could be turned into a weapon against the Anglo-Saxon domination. If, he affirmed, England should persist in refusing to Ireland the right of self-government, then Ireland, in her turn, will hinder England from governing herself. It was of no use, in his eyes, to raise a theoretic protest once or twice a year, or to invite every six or twelve months the champions of an arrogant supremacy to a courteous tournament. It was necessary to bring up in season and out of season the needs of Ireland, to mix up her cause with every question, to block every measure, to hinder every settlement, as long as the fatal knot was not untied. It was in some sort the application to modern politics of the Mezentian mode of punishment. Ireland must make England drag along the dead weight of her corpse as long as the word of resurrection and life was not pronounced to her profit. Those who placed the principle of an unfair and tyrannical union above the indestructible aspirations of a nationality would have, in their turn, to reap the bitter fruits of this forced association. They must learn in their own interests to wish for the divorce which they refused to the prayer of their partner.” M. de Pressensé enters into a detailed explanation of the forms of the House of Commons, to show how they were capable of being worked to serve the purposes of the Irish members. He goes on to sketch the early career of Mr. Parnell’s ally, Mr. Biggar, and describes some of the first exploits of the latter, including the memorable occasion on which he “espied strangers” when the Prince of Wales happened to be present in the gallery of the House, “honouring,” as he puts it with a touch of sarcasm, “his faithful Commons with his presence.”

We have a full account of the famous sitting of July 25, 1877, on the discussion of the South African Bill, on which our author thus remarks, in conclusion: “This scene, unprecedented in parliamentary annals, raised to the highest pitch the indignation of the House and of the public. Those even of the Liberals who had lent a helping hand to the first efforts of obstruction felt themselves obliged to repudiate all connection with Mr. Parnell and his friends. Mr. Courtney retired from the struggle, condemning equally the ‘brutality’ of the Ministry and of the Irish members. Mr. Butt strove to obtain from his party a formal disavowal of the extreme faction. All this mattered very little to Mr. Parnell; he had just received valuable encouragement from Ireland. A meeting in honour of himself and Mr. Biggar was held in Dublin, thronged by a crowd which accorded an enthusiastic welcome to the two members and an explicit approval of their policy. At the point to which affairs had come the final crisis could not be longer averted. The party must chose between Mr. Butt’s tactics and Mr. Parnell’s.” The failure of Mr. Butt’s efforts to get rid of his rival is narrated, and M. de

Pressensé thus sums up the state of affairs at the time of Mr. Butt's death in May 1879: "This event closed one phase of the history of Irish patriotism; Mr. Parnell was left without a rival."

The year of Mr. Butt's death was also rendered memorable by the formation of the organization soon to be famous as the Land League. Our author has shown in earlier portions of his book his clear comprehension of the agrarian question in Ireland, and he points out the inadequacy of the measures of reform previously passed to meet such a crisis as had by this time arisen. "The Land Act of 1870, excellent as were the intentions of those who drew it up, had not borne the fruits which its authors expected. The work of an English legislature in England, it carried, like all the acts of the British Government, the fatal mark of its origin, and it displayed an ignorance of the actual condition of Ireland of which the landlords and their lawyers had not failed to avail themselves, in order to frustrate the essential objects of the measure. It provided no guarantee against the extortion of back rents, the endemic disease of rural Ireland. In establishing the principle of a reasonable indemnity for all improvements actually made by the tenant, the legislature supposed it had sufficiently protected the small farmer against arbitrary eviction. It had not taken account of a fact of primary importance. For many peasants, their plot of land was their only resource. To deprive them of it was to plunge them into absolute misery without hope of relief. In consequence, the estimate of compensation ought to have been based, not upon the purchasing value of the plot of land, but upon the sum which was requisite in order to hinder the cultivator and his family from dying of starvation. All these defects, which had been manifest since the passing of the Act, assumed a tragic reality under the threatening prospect of a famine daily drawing nearer." There was every reason to believe that the horrible scenes which followed the famine of 1847 would be repeated, and that the landlords would, as in that year, carry out wholesale evictions of a starving people. Such has always been the contention of the founders of the Land League, and no serious attempt has ever been made to refute it. And any one who has read the story of the doings of the "Crowbar Brigade" after the great famine, as set forth, not in the declarations of excited patriots, but in the official reports of the agents of the English Government, will not be disposed to condemn any of the methods which can be proved to have been recommended by the leaders of the agrarian movement to prevent a renewal of those dire calamities. Of course it was the duty of the Government to take action in the face of such a pressing danger, and we may be certain that if, in our Indian famines, any class of persons had acted as the Irish landlords did in 1847, and were beginning to do in 1879, they would have soon found an effective check put on their proceedings. But a different rule was applied to Ireland. "It

was the part of the English Government to interfere to prevent such an abuse of the rights of property. Unfortunately, the Secretary for Ireland at that time was Mr. Lowther. Nothing could rival the narrowness of his intelligence and the obstinacy of his prejudices, except the levity of his mind and the hardness of his heart. When, in the early part of 1879, his attention was called in the House of Commons to the progress of the famine, he opposed haughty denials to the detailed assertions of the Irish members. On the 29th of March the Home Rulers provoked a debate to compel the Government to declare whether it was acquainted with the real state of affairs. Mr. Lowther was obliged to admit that there existed 'a certain' amount of depression in Ireland, but he hastened to add that the crisis was 'neither so general nor so acute as in other parts of the United Kingdom.' On that day Mr. Lowther, unconscious of what he was doing, had sealed the fate of the landowning class in Ireland. Suddenly, and almost by force, he had thrown Mr. Parnell into the ranks of the Land League." For, entirely as the League came to be identified in the public mind with the name of Mr. Parnell, it is an undoubted fact that not he, but Mr. Davitt, was its first founder, and that for some time he even held aloof from it. As our author puts it: "He hesitated long before taking a definite part. What decided him to cross the Rubicon was the apparition of famine. Mr. Parnell associated himself with the Land League, in the first place, in order to defend the rural classes against starvation; in the second place, to prepare a way for a settlement, which, in his eyes, would not stop short of the transfer of the ownership of the soil from the landlords to the cultivators."

The progress of the organization and the feeble attempts made by the Tory Government to check it are described by M. de Pressensé with clearness and conciseness. Mr. Parnell's visit to America is briefly touched on. M. de Pressensé does not even condescend to notice the ridiculous charges brought against the Irish leader, because, in asking pecuniary help from his countrymen in the United States for their distressed brethren at home, he did not minutely inquire into the antecedents of every subscriber, and refuse all assistance for the purposes of his constitutional movement from any one who had ever been engaged in revolutionary designs. In a page or two he rapidly sketches the events of the General Election of 1880, the increase in the number of Mr. Parnell's followers in Ireland, and the support given by the Irish in Great Britain to the Liberal party. It must be admitted that this help was not altogether well requited, but those English Liberals who were afterwards so exasperated at the persistently hostile attitude of the Irish towards Mr. Gladstone's Government must have recognized, if they reflected, that there were reasons for it. Mr. Parnell himself, as M. de Pressensé says, was not from the first altogether pleased with the magnitude of the

Liberal victory. "He knew that gratitude counted for nothing in politics, and he would have wished that the Irish electors, instead of increasing the Liberal majority to a degree which rendered it possible, and even easy, for them to dispense with the support of the Irish members, had kept the balance even between the parties, so as to render the alliance of the Nationalist section indispensable to secure a majority."

The circumstances which led to the introduction of the Compensation for Disturbance Bill, M. de Pressensé briefly enumerates, and he gives prominence to Mr. Gladstone's celebrated declaration that, in certain cases, evictions are equivalent in Ireland to sentence of death, which saying, fearfully true as it is, it must be confessed was not always remembered by the Liberal Government. The situation created by the rejection of the Bill by the Lords is thus described: "This vote placed the Government in a most difficult position. Raised to power by the wave of an irresistible Liberal reaction, they had believed themselves all-powerful, and they found themselves powerless before a Legislative Chamber which represented nothing more than the interests of a caste and the prejudices of a party. The natural proceeding would have been to have recourse to a dissolution, which would have permitted the country to pronounce the last word in the matter. The gravity of the Irish crisis, attested by the Ministers no less than by the Home Rulers, appeared to counsel, even to demand, this appeal to the electors. It was very difficult, certainly, for a party hardly emerged from the cold shades of opposition, and installed in the promised land of power, to consent with a light heart to renew the struggle, and to expose again to the hazards of battle the prize of so many labours."

In truth, the Lords had no right to think that they could compel the dissolution of a Parliament which had only just been elected. The best course which the Government could have taken would have been to revive the old practice of "tacking" another measure to a Bill of Supply, familiar to the Tories of William III. and Anne's reign, and have boldly sent up the rejected measure to the Peers again, attached to the Appropriation Bill. This would have been a fitting mode of dealing with their insolence, would have set a useful precedent to be followed on other occasions, and would have had the best effects in inspiring Ireland with confidence in the Government. As the Ministry resolved neither to dissolve nor to take any steps to compel the Lords to yield, the course they ought to have followed is well stated by M. de Pressensé. "One way alone there remained open to the Government, if it wished to hinder Ireland from falling, without hope and without remedy, into the abyss of wholesale eviction, tempered by wholesale assassination. They must use the discretionary powers which in some measure belonged to them, to modify the operation of a law of which they had been unable to obtain the

modification." He quotes the declaration of Mr. Forster that, if the landlords should exercise their rights in such a manner as to provoke an outburst of crime, the Government would accompany any demand for extraordinary powers with a measure for restraining unjust evictions. It was a great misfortune, as our author most truly remarks, that this promise was not kept, and that when Mr. Forster afterwards introduced a Coercion Bill of the most stringent character, no provision whatever was made to check the extreme exercise of their rights by the landlords.

On the contrary, as soon as the Act was passed the landlords began to evict on a wholesale scale, in order to deprive their tenants of the benefits of the coming Land Bill, and the Irish Secretary, far from restraining them, did his best to make their work easy.

Very effective is M. de Pressensé's comment on the promise made in Parliament by Mr. Forster that the Coercion Act of 1881 should only be employed against notorious criminals and "village ruffians." "In spite of the most positive engagements, a Coercion Act, obtained under the pretext of repressing crime, was employed to strike the authors of a political agitation." We have a telling exposure of the attempt subsequently made by Mr. Forster to show that his policy was vindicated by the Phoenix Park murders. "By a logical process, difficult to understand, he saw his own justification in what ought to have been a striking proof that his system had killed constitutional agitation and engendered political crime." M. de Pressensé has no doubt of the existence of an understanding between the Tories and the Irish party in 1885, nor does he suppose that Lord Carnarvon's negotiations with Mr. Parnell were undertaken without the full knowledge and consent of Lord Salisbury. And probably few reasonable persons, whatever their political opinions may be, will have much hesitation in coming to the same conclusion.

The history of Mr. Gladstone's conversion to Home Rule is briefly sketched on the basis afforded by his own pamphlet, *The History of an Idea*. Our author does not even condescend to notice the attempt to ascribe the Liberal leader's conduct to base motives of personal interest.

Far different, however, is his opinion of Mr. Chamberlain, on whom he passes the following caustic criticism:—"One theory alone can explain these strange vagaries of an old Radical. He had flattered himself that age would soon condemn Mr. Gladstone to retirement. Strong in the support of the powerful Radical group and the united body of Nonconformists, the Member for Birmingham thought to find in the brigade of Mr. Parnell the auxiliaries which would secure him victory. The conversion of Mr. Gladstone came to disappoint this pretty plan. Mr. Chamberlain had not a soul large enough to endure his disappointment. He thought of nothing but vengeance. He commenced for personal reasons the change of attitude which has

ended in transforming him into a personage to which no name can be given in the natural history of parties."

Our author's views on the Irish policy of the present Government are such as might be expected from the preceding portions of his work. He visits, with the censure it deserves, the short-sightedness of the Ministry in rejecting Mr. Parnell's Land Bill in 1886, though, in the very next Session, they confessed the injustice of that rejection by bringing in a similar measure themselves. He shows how the defensive organization of the Plan of Campaign was a necessity, under the circumstances, as a protection against wholesale eviction. "It is evident that this powerful and simple organization was in its essentials an adaptation to the conditions of rural Ireland of the English system of workmen's trades unions, and that it rested on the final sanction of public opinion. It was this alone that could hold the timid and hesitating and the treacherous fast to their agreement. It is clear enough that the Plan of Campaign was not inspired by a very scrupulous regard for legality. At the beginning the English members, frightened by its illegal character, showed themselves, not merely lukewarm in its defence, but expressly condemned it. Gradually, however, they came to perceive its necessity, and the good effects which had followed from it, and regarded it as one of those extreme resources which can neither be altogether refused to a people, nor employed with impunity, unless called for by cases of the utmost urgency."

Of the Coercion Act of 1887 M. de Pressensé writes in the following terms: "It surprised by its Draconian rigour an assembly which had already had much experience of exceptional legislation. One would have said that the drafter of the measure had taken for his motto the famous formula attributed to Lord Salisbury, in spite of his denials: "Ireland needs twenty years of suspension of Parliamentary Government." The new law had not the strictly temporary character of the measures which had preceded it. Whilst the former laws had to be renewed and prolonged by Parliament at the end of a period of one or two years, this one continues perpetually in full force, unless expressly repealed. Besides, the proposed Act has exhausted and concentrated in itself the quintessence of all the previous repressive measures. It suspends trial by jury, places the life, liberty, and honour of the accused at the mercy of removable magistrates, who are at the same time superior police officers, and each one of whom unites in himself the characters of bailiff, gendarme, judge, and gaoler. It creates new crimes, such as boycotting, which in the autumn of 1885 Lord Salisbury had declared must escape all penal legislation, which does not resign the last pretension to retain even a remnant of Liberal character. It gives to the Viceroy the power to proclaim dangerous, and to dissolve, every association which appears to him injurious, and to establish the state of siege in every district which seems to him disturbed."

Our author's opinion on the administration of the Act are in substance those of English Liberals generally, but they are worth quoting, as showing the judgment of an exceptionally well-informed foreign writer on a system of repression, which, we are told by Unionist organs like the *Spectator*, is far milder than would be enforced in any continental country under similar conditions. "Mr. Balfour governs with an iron hand. He understands that it is no use for him to trouble himself with constitutional scruples. Prosecutions and confiscations of newspapers, arbitrary arrests, sentences pronounced by removable magistrates, the complete assimilation of the treatment of political prisoners to that of common criminals—such are some of the methods which this new Strafford puts in force with implacable severity. All his subordinates know that, provided they serve the cause of order with zeal, they can reckon on the constant support of their chief in whatever abuses of power or whatever blunders they allow themselves to be involved."

Our author has confidence that the inherent sense of justice in the English people will bring about the final triumph of the Home Rule cause. In his concluding words he thus refers with force and pathos to the great Liberal leader: "Mr. Gladstone has completed his seventy-ninth year. Marvellously preserved in vigour as he is, and of this he has lately given a surprising proof at Birmingham, where he delivered a great speech before an audience of nearly 100,000 persons, we cannot be surprised that the Unionist party base their calculations on the prospects opened to view by the great age of this illustrious statesman. We seem to hear Mr. Gladstone murmur under his breath, 'O mihi prætentis referat si Jupiter annos.'"

As a sequel to this notice of M. de Pressensé's book, we may briefly mention another recent French work on the Irish question, *Lettres d'Irlande*, by M^{lle}. de Bovet. The authoress is a talented French lady who visited Ireland last autumn as a newspaper correspondent. Her letters are written in a most lively and interesting style, and well deserve a much more extended notice than can be given them here.

Her thorough impartiality cannot be disputed. She made it her business to study all sides of the question and to converse with representatives of all classes and parties. She is cautious in giving utterance to generalizations, but her conclusions evidently are that the state of Ireland is very unsatisfactory, and that there is no hope of any remedy from the policy which the Government are pursuing. And it is clearly her opinion that the Irish demand for Home Rule is, in its essence, a just one, and ought to be granted. Such judgments from intelligent and impartial foreign writers it is mere ignorant Philistinism to affect to despise. After all, the opinion of the civilized world does count for something, and every fresh piece of evidence shows more clearly the truth of Mr. Gladstone's claim to have this weighty force on his side.

AGNOSTICISM.

THE Agnostic idea—that is, the idea which underlies and forms the basis of the modern doctrine of Agnosticism—is not new. For more than three thousand years it has been floating about in the minds of thoughtful and pious men ; gradually acquiring consistency, definiteness, and practical value. Its development is marked by three well-defined stages : (1) The incipient, inchoate, or gestative stage ; (2) The speculative stage ; and (3) The positive or propagandist stage : and in this order we will discuss them.

I. THE INCIPIENT STAGE.

Leaving out the numerous indications of the prevalence of this idea among the Egyptians, Buddhists, and other Orientals, we pass at once to what is more to our purpose, and observe that, in the Book of Job, God is spoken of as doing “great things past finding out” ; and in the Psalms it is said “his greatness is unsearchable.” Isaiah, speaking in the name of the Lord, says : “For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways. For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts”—a passage which strikes a severe blow to that anthropomorphizing habit that became so rampant in after ages. Turning to the New Testament, we find Paul exclaiming, “How unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out” : not merely unknowable, be it observed, but “unsearchable,” a much stronger term. And then he asks, “Who hath known the mind of the Lord” ? Well, a good many modern pseudo-theologians think they can tell you a great deal about the mind of the Lord—about his intentions, his designs, his plans, his purposes, his affections, his volitions. Paul himself was very far from observing those precautions that were suggested to him in those higher flights of contemplation, but the point we note is that he was conscious of the limits of the understanding, although the limiting line was as yet very ill-defined. In writing to the Corinthians he repeats the expression, and contrasts our ignorance of the mind of God with the knowledge we have of the mind of Christ. Again, in 1 Tim. vi. 16, Paul speaks of God as “dwelling in light which no man can approach unto,” a very strong expression : it is not merely a light which no man can see, but which no man can approach.

Passing on to the ancient Fathers of the Christian Church, we see the Agnostic idea taking a more definite shape, and uttered in more explicit terms, though still wanting the philosophic precision it acquired some centuries later. Thus Arnobius, about A.D. 300, a writer in his earlier days as remarkable for Greek scholarship as afterwards for his Christian fervour, says:—"We are so far from attributing to God bodily lineaments that we fear to ascribe to so great an object even the graces of the mind, and the virtues in which to excel is hardly granted to a few. For who can speak of God as brave, as constant, as moderate, as wise? Who can say that he *knows* anything, that he *understands*, that he acts with *foresight*, that he directs the determination of his actions towards definite ends of duty? Whatever you can say of God, whatever you can conceive in silent thought, passes into a human sense, and is corrupted thereby; nothing can properly signify and denote him, which is expressed in terms of human speech framed for human uses. There is but one way in which man may understand with certainty concerning the nature of God, and that is to know and feel that nothing can be expressed concerning him in mortal speech." Augustine a few years later dwells on the impropriety of attributing human qualities to the Deity. He asks, "What then is worthily said of God? Some one may reply and say that *he is just*. But another with better understanding may say that even this word is surpassed by his *excellence*, and that even this is said of him unworthily, though it be said fittingly according to human capacity." Cyprian, a century before either of these, had written: "We cannot see him; he is too bright for our vision; we cannot scan him, he is too great for our intelligence; and therefore we but think of him worthily when we own him to be beyond our thought." Cyril of Jerusalem, in his Sixth Cataphrase, says: "We declare not what God is, but candidly confess that we know not accurately concerning him. For in those things which concern God, it is great knowledge to confess our ignorance." Basil, another saint of the same period, says: "That God is, I know; but what is his essence I hold to be above reason. How then am I saved? By faith: and faith is competent to know *that* God is, not *what* he is."

In the Reformed Church of England some of its most eminent divines found it necessary to protest continually against the growing habit of picturing, or rather caricaturing, the Deity by ascribing to him the passions and emotions of a man. Walter Charleton, about the middle of the seventeenth century writes: "For whoever shall consider how dangerous a phrenzy that brain must be disordered withal, that attempts to describe what it doth not, cannot know, will soon be satisfied that *amazement* and pious *silence* is the best lecture that can be read on that immense subject, of which when we have said all we can, we have said nothing, if we look forward to that

inexhaustible abyss of excellences, which must remain unspoken of and indeed uncomprehended; that a professed *Nescience* in this particular is the complement or zenith of all other *Science* which the mind of man is capable of in this life." Hooker in his *Ecclesiastical Polity*, says: "Dangerous it were for the feeble brain of man to wade far into the doings of the Most High; whom although to know be life, and joy to make mention of his name, yet our soundest knowledge is to know that we know him not as indeed he is, neither can know him."

Passages of similar purport to these abound in the writings of the most esteemed theologians of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. They are not quoted as authorities, but simply as evidence of the growth of an idea which was to assume a more definite form in the course of the following century.

II. THE SPECULATIVE STAGE.

We now arrive at that stage of human development when men clearly perceived that there were certain matters which were unsearchable, unknowable, unnamable, and past finding out; and in which no progress was made through the long ages that had elapsed since literature began to be cultivated. On the other hand, it was seen that in many branches of science and philosophy fresh additions were made to the treasury of human knowledge from year to year. About the end of the seventeenth century this discrepancy had become so marked, that certain thinkers of the first rank applied themselves to an investigation of the causes that led to such anomalous results. Among them was John Locke, who struck the key-note of modern philosophical inquiry. "Five or six friends," said he, "meeting at my chambers and discoursing on a subject very remote from this, found themselves quickly at a stand, by the difficulties that rose on every side. After we had for a while puzzled ourselves, without coming any nearer to a resolution of those doubts that perplexed us, it came into my thoughts that we took a wrong course: and that before we set ourselves upon inquiries of that nature, it was necessary to examine our own abilities, and see what objects our understandings were fitted or not to deal with." This conviction was followed by his famous *Essay concerning Human Understanding*. Availing himself of the researches of Bacon and Hobbes in England, of Descartes in France, and of Leibnitz in Germany, he saw that *consciousness*, and especially *self-consciousness*, was the pivot around which all inquiries must turn. He proposed to himself in that celebrated essay to "inquire into the original certainty and extent of human knowledge, together with the grounds and degrees of belief, opinion and assent," which is a very fair outline of what the modern Agnostic is aiming to accomplish in accord-

ance with the results of later research. He was followed by Kant and a host of Kant's disciples, more or less truculent, who, though following independent and often divergent lines of thought, were all agreed in their determination to investigate, sift, and analyse the phenomena of consciousness by persistent and penetrating introspection. Previously, pretenders to theology and philosophy had made assertions which never could be justified by an appeal to consciousness, nor could they be safely inferred from the facts of consciousness. Many of these dogmas were now discredited, repudiated, and become obsolete.

I should greatly exceed the limits of an occasional article if I were to furnish quotations from the celebrated authors that now appear on the scene. Passing by such redoubtable names as those of Berkeley, Fichte, Schelling, Pascal, Cousin, and others scarcely less renowned, it will be sufficient to say that Sir Wm. Hamilton with his disciples, Dean Mansel and Prof. Ferrier, have, by their conjoint labours and after making themselves perfectly acquainted with the above-named author, placed the philosophy of consciousness on a footing so demonstrably secure that no serious attempts have since been made to undermine it. Its axioms are simple and unassailable as those of geometry. The differences among philosophers are owing to the inferences drawn from the undisputed facts of consciousness, and not concerning the facts themselves. These differences have in some cases been very great, leading often to bitter controversy, as must be the result when the vague colloquial language of common life is imported into discussions which require the most rigorously exact definition. Nevertheless, Hamilton boldly announced his doctrine of the unknowable, and in an oft-quoted passage declared that "The last and highest consecration of all true religion must be an altar to the unknown and unknowable God." Nor did the doctrine startle that class of thinkers and preachers who had been trained in the methods of psychological analysis. To be told that they knew nothing, and could know nothing, but their own states of consciousness, aroused in them no opposition. To be told that the very existence of any world exterior to themselves was merely a matter of inference, appeared to them perfectly reasonable. They saw as clearly as the sun at noonday, that the universe as it exists apart from our states of consciousness was utterly unknowable. Our sensations, thoughts, and judgments are so indissolubly bound up with every fact of consciousness that the separation of what the mind contributes from that which exists apart from the mind was impossible. As Ferrier remarks: "Everything which I or any intelligence can apprehend, is steeped primordially in me—and it ever retains and ever must retain the flavour of that original impregnation. Whether the object be what we call a thing, or what we call a thought, it is equally impossible for any

effort of thinking to grasp it as an intelligible thing or as an intelligible thought, when placed out of all connection with the ego. This is a necessary truth of all reason—an inviolable law of all knowledge, and we must take it as we find it."

We are not much moved, therefore, when we hear bumptious third-rate orators pompously asking, Who shall presume to set bounds to the human intellect? or, Who shall presume to draw the line between the knowable and the unknowable? The answer is ready to our hand. Nature, with its inexorable laws, has set the limit and drawn the line. Did Copernicus, when he rejected the geocentric system of astronomy, prescribe the line in which the planets should go circling round the sun? Or Kepler, when he proved that the planets revolved in elliptical orbits, and not in circles? Or Newton, when he demonstrated that they not only *did* but *must* (allowing for perturbations) move in elliptical orbits? Obviously, in each case, the orbits of these bodies were the result of physical laws that had been in operation for ages, and all that astronomers pretended to do was to find out those orbits, not to assign them. And so it is with the line of demarcation between the knowable and the unknowable. The line has existed for millenniums, but owing to the more recondite nature of the phenomena it was not till quite recently the line was clearly seen. This clearer insight has enabled all reflecting men to free themselves from superstition and dogma, and the consequences of that liberty may be seen in the pulpit as well as in the professorial chair. We who can look back upon fifty years of experience in connection with church and chapel cannot help noticing the change which has come over our preachers. The Agnostic spirit, long before it received the name "Agnostic," had so permeated the churches that where we used to hear the most confident and unreserved assertions respecting heaven, hell, the future, the designs of God, we have now more caution and reticence, with a frank confession of inscrutable and unfathomable mystery. And although we often meet with certain belated individuals who fancy their fossilized notions are the very bulwarks of divine truth, and who bristle up at the appearance of a word or phrase which is not found in their time-worn vocabulary, we have only to leave them alone, and the quiet dawn of intellectual light may be safely trusted to dispel the errors they retain more from lack of insight and penetration than from wilfulness or obstinacy.

III. THE POSITIVE OR PROPAGANDIST STAGE.

Logicians have often insisted on the importance of a "name." Any object, function, organ, or doctrine that can be designated only by a circumlocution, must always present itself to the mind as a ghostly, wraithlike thing, that cannot be handled or grasped, and its company is, as far as possible, avoided. "A doctrine or discovery,

says Archbishop Thomson, "can hardly be said to be secured until it has been marked by a name which shall serve to recall it to those who have once mastered its nature, and to challenge the attention of those to whom it is still strange." This well describes the service rendered to literature by the word "Agnostic." To all the great thinkers and writers of the past hundred years the doctrine of the unconditioned or unknowable was perfectly familiar, and no one who understood the subject saw any ground for controverting it. We need not repeat the oft-told story of the invention of the term by Prof. Huxley and its adoption by the *Spectator*. It is well within the memory of men who have passed middle age that the use of the word spread so rapidly that it became current wherever the English language was spoken; and then it was that the small fry of the pulpits, the debating societies, and discussion clubs felt that their mission began. They had picked up a new word, and they fancied it represented a new thing; and that any one outside their narrow coteries should venture to suggest the need of a revision of their ideas concerning God, the soul, immortality, duty, &c., was an arrogance that they could not brook. Their opposition, however, served to attract still greater attention to the name.

Other causes were also at work which not only forced the name into greater prominence, but demanded a more explicit statement of its connotations. Two great systems of philosophy, the Positive, founded and promoted by Comte, Littré and Harrison; the Evolutionary theory, identified with the names of Darwin, Spencer, Wallace, Fiske, and others, alike in this one respect, postulated the existence of an unknowable reality of which all phenomena were manifestations. There were besides a large body of Christian ministers scattered in different parts of the country, who had adopted the views of Hamilton, Mansel, Ferrier, and some of the German metaphysicians. In the principles they enunciated these preachers saw nothing conflicting with their own views, and a profession of them excited no opposition and caused no scandal. This was the state of affairs when Prof. Huxley introduced the name Agnostic, which according to his view was a sort of label to distinguish a class of thinkers which he hardly knew how otherwise to designate. "Agnosticism," says he, "simply means that a man shall not say he knows or believes that which he has no scientific grounds for professing to know or believe. . . . Agnosticism says that we know nothing of what may be beyond phenomena." This described very fairly the views of the preachers referred to, and the profession of Christian Agnosticism became widely prevalent. Their creed might be condensed as follows:—Accepting the picture of Christ as delineated in the Gospels, and yielding a hearty assent to the moral principles exhibited in the life of Jesus, they elect to live in conformity with that standard; they hold themselves ready to

believe everything in the sacred writings that can be supported by adequate evidence, while they refuse to pretend to a knowledge of that they do not know, and which they are sure no human being has the faculty of knowing.

So far there was little cause of disagreement amongst those capable of forming an unbiassed judgment. But before any practical use could be made of the above rather vague formulas, it was found necessary to answer another question that had forced itself on the attention of the thinking class—viz., If some things are knowable and others unknowable, how are we to draw the line and say which belong to one class and which to the other?

With the world in this state of mental preparation and expectant attention, the new name was quickly incorporated in the English language, and propagandists found it necessary to define more accurately the limits fixed by Nature to the human powers of knowing and thinking. The barest summary of the Agnostic position as most recently defined, is all that can be here attempted.

The one certain, ultimate, unanalyzable fact of experience is that of personal self-consciousness.

A state of consciousness distinctly recognized is called a phenomenon or appearance; the cause is called noumenon or reality. In other words, by phenomena we mean not only the objects observed by the external senses of seeing, hearing, &c., but also everything manifested to the internal sense of intuition, perception, comparison, &c.

Knowledge is the entering into consciousness of external realities. Whatever we are distinctly conscious of, we know. What never enters consciousness, we cannot know.

We know phenomena, as facts of consciousness, directly and immediately. Noumena only by inference. But there are many inferences derived from the facts of consciousness which are as trustworthy as consciousness itself. This occurs when we are conscious of the validity of the logical process by which the inference was formed. Thus I have not the slightest doubt that the waters of the Thames, of the Danube, and the Zambesi, when purified from extraneous matters, would all be found to consist of oxygen and hydrogen in the same proportion. Of course this confidence cannot arise from direct consciousness, for I have not tested either; but the processes of observation and reasoning which have conducted us to this conclusion are so complete as to leave no room for doubt.

Belief is the trust we place in judgments respecting phenomena, our knowledge of which is imperfect. Our trust will be greater or less according to the means we have of forming a judgment and the evidence that can be brought forward in its support.

Faith is of two kinds. There is the faith that springs from a belief so strong as to enlist the co-operation of the will, and show

itself in action ; but there is also another kind of faith which consists in a trust of opinions and judgments, for which we can give no reason and furnish no evidence, and is sometimes distinguished as faith proper. The existence of a First Cause, though inconceivable, is one of them ; our trust in the uniformity of Nature is another. The apprehension of the unknowable is purely an act of faith. We cannot admit that human knowledge and human consciousness exhaust the possibilities of the universe. On the contrary, we think they cover but a very humble portion. The unknowable, though entirely beyond the grasp of human consciousness, is apprehended as real, and of infinite importance. When realities enter consciousness, they become *known as facts of consciousness*, but till then are absolutely unknowable, and are objects of faith, pure and simple.

These are simple elementary truths that have been recognized by philosophers for ages. The great commotion recently observed arises from the more general recognition of them by the mass of reflecting men, and their practical application in the working out of religious, moral, and philosophical problems. Till quite lately they were regarded as intellectual curiosities rather than as truths of universal application. But the progress of Biblical criticism, the break-up of the old theologies, the intense dissatisfaction generally felt in regard to our social arrangements, have thrown us back to the reconsideration of first principles, and have forced us to inquire how it has come about that so many things should be accepted as known, so many things believed for which there is no rational foundation whatever.

Just now the Agnostic idea appears to have been developed to a well-defined point. It is accepted by all competent thinkers that we know nothing, and can know nothing, but our states of consciousness ; and the inquiry now turns upon the *interpretation of the facts of consciousness*. Do they teach us anything of the reality which underlies consciousness ? Nothing can be more unlike a loaf of bread than the leavening ferment to which it owes its properties ; possibly nothing could be more unlike the facts of consciousness than the realities from which they spring. On the other hand, it is contended by Prof. Seth and some thinkers of the Hegelian school, that " in knowing the phenomenon we know the object itself through and through. . . . It is true that we do not know the *whole* nature probably of anything ; and the term noumenon is useful, therefore, as contrasting the object in all the completeness of the qualities which really belong to it, with the comparatively imperfect knowledge of its qualities which we have yet attained. The noumenon is the object from the point of view of the universe ; the phenomenon is the same object from the point of view of human knowledge. The noumenon embraces in this way the qualities yet to be discovered, as well as those already known, while the term phenomenon is necessarily limited to what we actually know."

This is admirably put ; but it seems to me to overlook the undoubted fact that the noumenon or reality in manifesting itself to consciousness, becomes so overlaid and mixed up with our own perceptions and sensations, as to make it impossible to say how much of the phenomenon is due to the ego and how much to the objective reality. For example, what is there in a lily corresponding to what we call its odour ? or to its colour ? If there were no olfactory nerves and no optic nerves in the world, there would be neither scent nor colour. Again, the perception of difference between the sensations of scent and colour lies entirely within the mind of the percipient. These sensations and judgments are so inextricably mixed up with the sensuous impressions made by the lily, that it is impossible to say what the lily is in itself apart from the qualities we assign to it, and which qualities we know are very largely the creations of our own minds. The quality of stimulating the optic nerve possessed by the object is clearly very different from the response of the nerve to the stimulus. The response we know ; but what do we know of the stimulus except that it stimulates ?

To the Agnostic this is still an open question. Of the facts of consciousness, he is sure. As to the interpretation of, and the inferences derivable from them, his attitude is that of expectant receptivity.

LIBERTY OF THE SUBJECT (FEMALE).

ENGLAND, since the day on which her people wrung from the tyrant John an unwilling consent to the charter of her rights, has made constant, yet comparatively slow, progress in the establishment of liberty of the subject. Though freedom has spread in all civilized countries, England, through some exceptional circumstances, has led the van in the march of progress. The isolated position, which for years prevented the spread of civilization to her shores, enabled her afterwards to guard the germ which had been planted in her soil, and left her free to turn that attention to internal affairs which other less fortunately situated countries expended on warfare with their neighbours. Somewhat of her success in developing the grand organization of constitutional freedom, not by fits and starts, but slowly, surely, and, we trust, enduringly, may be the result of the Northern strain which runs unmixed with any element from the impulsive South in the blood of her children. Long have the waves of progress been pressing against the barriers of tyranny, of tradition, and of custom ; many a buttressed outwork has been swept away, at times with blind rush of foam and spray, at others in comparative rest and silence, before the insidious force which has mined below ! Breach after breach has, in one way or another, been effected, inch after inch has been gained ; but for this nineteenth century, it has been reserved to see the accumulated flood, its rage spent, comparatively unopposed, triumphantly bearing all before it, and wooing us to embark, trusting to the whisper of hopeful gales, upon its bosom ! Dreadful things did our forefathers prophesy of the time when that flood should find entrance ! What would they say to our liberty, our movement in the days on which we have entered ? Imagine a poor ghost of two hundred, or even one hundred years ago, introduced into this gas flaring, steam belching, telegram wiring, electric lighting, telephone sounding nineteenth century, with its thousand-tongued printing presses, its rustle of papers, its unopposed monster meetings, and its freedom of pen and tongue ! Tell the amazed visitor that England and her Indian Empire are brought within speaking distance ; that our ships pass where formerly the ships of the desert alone trod, and reach the shores of India in weeks where his contemporaries reckoned months ! Tell him that slavery is abolished both by England and her powerful daughter ! Tell him that ignorance is ceasing to be looked on as the safe guide of the lower classes, that a dame

school is scarce to be found with seeking, that village lads and lasses have the rule of three at their fingers' ends, that country schools are affiliated to high art centres, and that, where their fathers toiled with painful art and hard-drawn breath over the abstruse and unawakening drudgery of the three R's as adapted to the rural capacity, nimble fingers trace, at the bidding of clear and interested brains, things of beauty, if not "to be a joy for ever," to be the delight and wonder of many a cottage home! Further, announce to the bewildered shade that, not content with all this, we are about to make a leap in the dark—into manhood suffrage and free education, and probably, with such a feeling as in mortals accompanies a sudden discernment of lack of clothing, he will request to be at once relegated to "Limbo," or those safe precincts in which happy phantoms reside. A series of surprises truly has the nineteenth century reserved for the later of her children to see! Some who remember the still green pastures of even seventy years ago, though they take kindly to benefits and luxuries which the science and freedom of the age furnish them with, shake their heads bodingly at each new plaything mother Century brings from its hiding place: "There is a danger of children being spoilt, of an end to parental rule;" indeed, of "an assumption of misrule, and a break up of all things"! Well, the tide has come, and we must swim with it; there is no forcing back the waters, no "here and no farther;" and those who attempt to shut the flood-gates, to restore or repair the barriers, are wasting precious time, which might be spent in accommodating themselves and others to the altered circumstances.

Our country is now bent on a mission of justice to the individual. Science is exhausting her resources to prolong the lives of the meanest and the weakest! Philanthropy spends its treasures on the wretched, the worthless, and even the criminal! In such circumstances, in such an atmosphere, it is impossible for anything in the nature of oppression or injustice to flaunt itself in the light of day, and the emancipation of women from the fetters and prejudices which have bound them in the past is a matter of time only. Much has been done, but more has to follow. This revolution, if such it can be called, has come slowly, as, in the very nature of it, it must have done, as indeed it does in every case where the victims are helpless till aided from without. Slavery, that great social fungus, though withering under the rays of the great orb of liberty, still holds its own in the shade, and for years may still do so.

The equality of the sexes found an advocate here and there even among the writers of pagan Rome, and it seems strange to us that where religion taught its youth to worship at the shrine of Venus, filled its imagination with the chastity and beauty of Diana, and bade it seek for wisdom and honour at the hands of Minerva, the frail sex were not held in higher esteem. The sensuality of the

South, which displayed itself even in its mythology, was doubtless the strongest deterrent; next, the military element, which dominated Rome and all States that dared to cope with her. Sparta, when it allowed the same exercises to women as to men, did so merely to improve the organization which produced the race—that is to say, the fighting element only—showing that men had no more scruples in destroying the softness and grace of woman when it suited their convenience, than they have now in sacrificing her individuality to an ideal they form to suit their tastes and requirements! In the pagan North, the home of the most perfect physical strength, strange as it seems, we trace amidst great barbarity a germ of respect for the weaker sex; the rude warriors there, exulting in feats of strength, calling on their mighty gods, Odin and Thor, celebrating in song the feasts and war councils of their Walhalla, yet had moments of soft poetry, of tenderness for their comparatively chaste wives and daughters. Theirs was the land of great extremes, contrasts that made themselves felt. Theirs was the land of the mighty forces of wind and water, yet there, where the frost sealed the dark waters of the fiord, were the crystal caves in which dwelt the “ice maid,” and where the wind in its fury shattered the pine trees was the home of the “snow maiden.” Suddenly that cold frozen land shook off the chains of winter, and leapt, decked in fresh pasture, to the arms of summer! The fiords, running free, sparkled and danced in the sunbeams, the trees shook their sprays in merriment to the wooing of the breeze, the flowers sprang out laughingly from their hiding places, and all Nature waited, and longed for the coming of the God Balder, the gentle, the ever-delaying, Balder the Beautiful; and men’s hearts laughed in them as they saw the strong and the stern conquered and led captive by beauty, and they, too, laid themselves at the feet of their women, whose arms were white as the snow wreath, and whose hair looked golden as the larch streamers on which shone the sun! Thus, encircled with halo of poetry, passed generally unharmed, and in freedom, the women of the North midst the rough natures that encompassed them, even swaying with their tongues in the councils the stronger to their will!

On the Middle Ages, in their roughness and strength, came the spirit of chivalry, born of the Christ religion, with the elevation in its exemplar of the passive virtues, and carried on in the romantic love of that land which was hallowed by His presence and marked by His footsteps. Young knights, seeking for glory both in heaven and on earth, devoted themselves to the task of redeeming that sacred soil from the defilement of the infidel. In ecstatic visions, born of fast and vigil, they believed themselves the elected of the “Queen of Heaven.” In the halo which emanated from her all members of the sex were encircled! They saw her purity and beauty in the lady of their affections, to both they swore fealty, to

all helpless dames they were protectors. When the Renaissance held sway over the sunny land of Italy and spread its influence to our shores, it imbued poets, painters, and sculptors with admiration for the arts of Greece, but Religion directed pen, brush, and chisel, and the world was called on to admire a "Divine Comedy," a "Madonna and Child," and a "Moses." Although, especially in the South, Classicalism fostered a spirit of contempt for woman, and encouraged sensuality, yet she could not be degraded as in the days of heathenism; the highest and the purest recognized her as their central power, the most beautiful theme of art, and an underlying stratum of respect showed itself in "adorations" of the holy mother, in galaxies of female saints, and in the pure figure of a "Beatrice." In England this idea of woman was continued and strengthened on the accession of a virgin queen, who, by virtue of her womanhood, appealed to the chivalry of the nation, its expression finding vent in the grace and sweetness of a Spenser, who blinds us with the effulgence of his "Gloriana," and enlists our tender homage for the purest and loveliest of creations, the chaste and gentle "Una!" With sufficient din of distant war to keep alive the martial flame and fan the ardour of youth, rousing it to dreams of fame, and to win the fair with gallant deeds; with the echo of trumpets and drum and clash of arms mingling with the music of gay pageants and the pipe and tabor of rural feasts, the triumphant progress of woman continued.

The harsh note of civil war broke the spell, a note which sent chivalry in its plumes and satins to roll in the dust, and beauty, stripped of its armoury, to hide in corners till the day of wrath should be over-past. Stern denouncers were those hard-smiting Puritans of manly vanities and feminine "pretensions." "Painted Eve's flesh," which was as a bait to the unwary, was bidden listen in shame-faced humility to the tedious admonitions of any long-winded "minister of the Lord" who chose to assert himself. Our ancestresses had reason to congratulate themselves that the admirers of the barbaric and struggling ages of Jewish history went no further, that to the prey of the "Godly" were not added "a damsel or two apiece," and that polygamy was not practised by the "elect." Art shared in the ban of beauty, and received little quarter at the hands of self-appointed "avengers of the Lord" and "bearers of the sword of Gideon"! The reaction which succeeded the dreary blight experienced by art and refinement in the days of Puritanism brought with it a flood of levity, irreligion, and vice, and was more harmful to woman's character, and thus to her cause. Pretence of chivalry without the reality, its clothes decking apes, heralded in an age of coarse gossip and malicious slander, an age of scenic love-making, of make-believe honour, and parade of duels, an age of affected wit and specious gallantry, slightly veneering and thinly veiling the coarsest of morals and the meanest and most selfish of motives.

Again came to the throne a virgin queen, again the voice of chivalry spoke, and pure morals from a pure Court spread in runlets of freshness through the land. Peace and prosperity hovered over a nation which had gained firmness by steady grappling with oppression, which had discarded falsity, which had looked into the face of tradition, and, heedless of her spells, was no longer afraid to question assertion and pretence at all hazards, and to give them their quietus ! Science now holds up her head and speaks unproved ; Criticism, unchecked, uses her dissecting knife ; Charity, from high places, stoops to the ground of the lowly ; last, but not least, Religion has re-examined her standing points and holds aloft her lamp, no longer fearing its extinction by the breath of truth. Slavery of all sorts has now the veil of expediency torn from its face, and must allow its cause and law of being to be searched into. Thus has arisen the idea of the emancipation of women ; it forms part of that flood of liberty which cannot be stopped ; for it, apart from the rest of that flow, there cannot be a "thus far, and no farther." Arguments of all sorts have been hurled against the idea. One or two of these, which make for subjugation and non-emancipation, we may here glance at.

"Women are distinctly in mind and body inferior to men ; therefore, nature points them out as meant to be subject." This, the argument for the slavery of coloured races, not having commended itself to the enlightenment of the day, can hardly be considered worthy of an answer. Still, we may say, that the inferiority, and the degree of inferiority, have yet to be decided. There is no doubt that a large percentage of the female sex is intellectually equal and in many cases superior to the *average* man, and this in spite of women's drawbacks and disadvantages, their lack of solid education, and neglect of faculties, which, having lain dormant through centuries, should be at expiring point. Physical weakness—though that also, in great part, arises from disuse of muscle in deference to the opinions of men, who prefer languid grace to strength, agility, and even health, in the other sex—we need not dwell upon, as no physical weakness debars men from the exercise of their individual or political privileges. "Women will be unsexed by being placed on the same level as men, and will become unwomanly." If we take a seed, wishing from that to develop a perfect natural growth of all which that seed has in it to become, we act as handmaidens to Nature. We allow free growth, we humour affinities, we encourage all aspirations, and, if the seedling is to maintain itself in time, as all really fit and true things should, independently of artificial help and shelter, we must strengthen and inure it to the rains and storms which we cannot banish from nature's category ; then, some day, we may hope to see it spread into a beautiful specimen of a well-rooted, perfectly developed tree. On the other hand, it is in our

power, suiting our fancy, to give that seed a direction against its nature; we may pinch off a shoot here and a shoot there, we may cramp the roots, and stunt the whole tree to miniature proportions; or we may encourage abnormal growth, force into precocity, and support over-taxed fruition with props—in fact, meddle with nature as we will—but we must not then confuse her characteristics with the idiosyncrasies of art. Woman has been treated so much in the latter ways, that it is difficult to define her truly. We know that if a man shows himself particularly weak, silly, or sensitive, he is called womanish; and, on the other hand, we know that fortitude and endurance, the constant and necessary accompaniments of womanhood in its course of unglorified suffering, are called manly virtues! Give woman all needful facilities for her full development, and if she then rises to the same platform as man stands on she will prove her right to be there. We would ask those who lay stress on the “physical strain” which there is a danger of incurring, to reckon up, if they can, some of the numberless cases of languid inertia and incurable hysteria which inanity and aimlessness of life are at the root of in many women, as well as the worse developments of extravagance, frivolity, and moral ruin. Also, to be honest, let them seek statistics of those young men who are yearly ruined in mind or body by such examinations as our Indian Civil Service, statistics unfortunately known to few, for the break down is not always with the unsuccessful, but with those who, unhinged by the strain, give out after a year or two of service. The cram of girls, who have constantly to compress into one year’s work the teaching which should have been led up to through many, should properly be ranked with such a test.

We are quite aware that women themselves are a barrier to the advancement of their more eager sisters, and we are not altogether surprised to find it so. If women have had a prison, it has often been a gilded one. Freedom from responsibility has its charms, especially to characters not strong; slavery always demoralizes its victims, and its paralysing influences are not dissipated even in a century. There are worthy and respectable dames, who cast horror-struck glances at their would-be emancipators, who snub the aspirations of the young and ardent of their sex, by telling them it is for man to rule, and the “whole duty” of woman to obey; but we pay little heed to these stern moralists, who seldom put their creed into practice, and who are themselves the exponents of its falsity and impossibility! We are quite aware that they are exceedingly averse to any interference of their husbands in the domestic machinery or in any province supposed to be under the presidency of the feminine gender. We listen with strangely blent feelings of the humorous and the painful to the snubbings they bestow on their “lords” when they feebly complain, and even meekly, of indigestible mutton, of

an unvaried round of cookery, or a remarkable absence of their favourite dish; and we feel exceedingly uncomfortable when these preachers of humility, with very little reverence in their own cases, throw doubt on the pet stories and cold water on the innocent jokes of their masculine preceptors. People, who take the letter of the law as opposed to the spirit, quote the Bible against both emancipation and non-subjugation; others say these "new ideas are making women infidels." Most of us are learning, in this scientifically enlightened century, that shutting our eyes to truth is proof of moral cowardice, and not a sign of strong belief. Women, whether granted a higher education or not, cannot shut their eyes to what they see and hear, and to facts that press themselves on their notice; the more pure and single-minded they are the less will they fear the light, and the more they, too, will refuse credence to all they feel to be illogical and false. Superstition walks to-day, but as a ghost! Why this fear that women will turn from religious belief? Is there not an unexpressed feeling that women, at all events the educated of them, will rebel against the chains that so-called Christianity has riveted on them, and, feeling the unreasonableness of the demands on their submission, differing in no way from that of ignorant and unformed children, will discard Christianity altogether? We fear there is a truth in this. Through long centuries women, even more generally than men, have been the upholders and supporters of religion, and of its ministers in all denominations; the latter has been even urged against them as proving an innate love on their parts of being under authority. Women, doubtless, from the feeling of physical weakness, and in the starvation of their intellects, are attracted by any one who to their notions represents power, as men are attracted to feebleness and weakness; but, as the former waken intellectually, they will not have the same reverence as of old for things which they are rising on a level with, and they will not readily, without questioning, accept beliefs when they are able to gauge their would-be preceptors; this assertion is being verified in politics as well as in religion: rightly or wrongly, women are now beginning to think for themselves! Women, on the whole, are said to manifest more interest in religion than men do; we do not think this is one of the outcomes supposed to be bound up in the peculiar conformation of a woman's bodily and spiritual framework, or that the sentimentality which often accompanies it is exemplified only in the weaker sex. Given healthy active conditions of mind and body, much hysterical emotion will certainly disappear.

The causes of the special affinities of women with religion are plain enough to view: their lives are not so full as the lives of men are of absorbing interests and ambitions; those they have are chiefly of a domestic character; unless they are in the whirl of society they have more time than men for kindnesses and charities, and, there-

fore, are more in contact with those whose care and occupation the poor and the sick are—namely, the clergy. Again, the trials and anxieties of a mother's life, unrelieved often by interest from without, press home with a strain that makes support from a higher source a necessity. It is the seeking and obtaining of strength from this source which spreads a halo round many a woman, and gives her that quiet power which ensures reverence; it is a fear for the loss of this sacred dignity which makes many true respecters of womanhood dread its entrance on the noisier path of man. It will be, indeed, sad for women, and still sadder for the men they elevate and refine, if religion should become to them a non-reality! We think it is time, if the various religious bodies value the help and assistance of their hitherto powerful supporters, and wish to keep in their folds the best and purest of their female flocks, that they should give some consideration to their feelings. To say the least of it, the vow of obedience inculcated at the entrance of a woman on matrimony does not conduce to strengthen the influence of the Churches. By numbers that vow is taken with repugnance, by many it is looked on as a mere formula, and by all it is broken! It is not part of the marriage service in all Christian countries, and wisely, for in such a delicate complex partnership as is matrimony the less ruling from outside the better. The effect of this promise has been to make men tyrannical, and women rebellious and self-assertive; and it has been the ruin of thousands of married lives. (One thing, and one thing only, will make man or woman submissive, and that is love. If the words of St. Paul and St. Peter are to be brought forward as authority on this subject, we say that Christians are making the same mistake as when they quoted the former in defence of slavery; religion is taking the letter and discarding the spirit. Through long dark centuries woman's lot has been one of degradation, as much under the polygamy and concubinage of the Jews, as in the Eastern countries where they are practised still. Daylight dawned for the sex when the exaltation of one of them brought hope in lieu of punishment to the human race; no longer was woman accursed, but blessed!

If the spirit of Christianity has made, and does make, for woman's freedom, how can we, how can she, reconcile that spirit with the letter of bondage? We cannot, neither can the thinking women of the day. The Apostles were men of their time, imbued with its prejudices, moulded by its customs. St. Peter was a Jew of the Jews, at first as we know him a bigot, never a man of ready convincible spirit. St. Paul, to his Jewish extraction, united the training of the Greek school, at no time very credulous of the intellectual or even moral strength of women; above everything he was a man of policy; with all his renunciation he was, we feel, a man of the world. The strength of his convictions was shown by his determined persecution

of the Christians, and his earnestness after conversion to their cause. He was not a man to be led this way or that, to give up an opinion once formed and to receive readily new ideas. This is the man who, it appears, was called on to deal with a question of discipline, a question of the Church about the position of women. Could we doubt what his line would be, he who would make the people obedient to the authority even of wicked or heathen rulers? He would head no revolution; to him it was not given to be a leader in the paths of freedom, to spread the flag of revolt. Was this not the wisdom necessary for the preservation of Christianity in perilous times, when, weak and struggling for its very existence, it found the hands of all men against it? What but ruin could have come of a crusade against slavery and subjection in those ages? What would have been the result of preaching the later gospel which is ours of to-day? Upheaval of all that was solid by all that was base and wicked! Men then were not fit for freedom, still less women. In those times the sexes did not freely intermingle as now; in the frightful sensuality and licence of those days the only safeguard a virtuous woman had was her home, the only protector her husband, when once she had left her father's roof. Had St. Paul made the life and condition of Christian women freer than those of their heathen sisters, the latter might have professed Christianity to both their and its undoing, and the men would have fought against a system that interfered with their domestic affairs. St. Paul, however, though he would not interfere with established conditions except by amelioration, endeavoured to safeguard the woman's position by putting the husband in the place of the very highest type of manhood; he claimed the headship; assigning to the woman, considered so feeble and frail, the place of the erring Church, he hands her over to her husband to be loved with the same unselfish love that was shown by its head, and enjoins upon him the self-abnegation, the absolute self-sacrifice of Christ; if the one was to yield the other was to abnegate.

Interpreting with especial harshness the precepts of religion as regards woman, the law has made the subjection implied in the word obedience to press very heavily on the weaker sex; it has taken the words "to be one" to mean the husband alone, and, swallowing up her identity completely in his, has delivered the wife over to his mercy, while it did not—in fact, could not—enforce the abnegation the Apostle enjoins on the husband. Very different indeed has its spirit been from that of Him who said, "For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and be joined to his wife, and they twain shall be one flesh." We demand obedience of children, because they are ignorant and inexperienced, for their own good; no parents who are wise demand it when their boys and girls have attained years of discretion; it is exacted by a higher Parent from the offspring who are unable to understand His laws. There is in these days no such

reason for obedience from a wife to her husband. Women have now as much knowledge of life and the world as men, often more. They are first-rate administrators and excellent organizers; if they have not the highest intellectual faculties, which is not a matter to be settled in one generation, they have qualities which eminently fit them to be rulers in their own provinces, where a man interfering makes havoc.

The peace and the usefulness of many a woman's life is ruined by the one little word she has had to say at the altar; husbands have, as a rule, the habit of reminding their wives that they are supreme, and that if they choose to take the responsibility of what is to be done upon themselves, their "better halves" must give in, and if they do not agree must stultify their convictions and obliterate themselves. Tyrants of this sort, who interfere in every domestic matter, treat their wives as upper servants, and practically deny them the possession of a conscience, are far more numerous, even amongst men who call themselves Christians, than are the chivalrous and the sympathetic. The self-assertion of the female sex, brought forward as a proof of its abuse of power, is rather the misuse of unaccustomed power, bred of the bitterness it feels towards those who allow neither its capabilities nor its claims. Women, like men, have characters and ambitions; these, allowed no natural scope, will work, as they mostly have done, in the former sex by underhand or violent means; deceit in the timid, and self-assertion in the stronger, have long been the outcome of woman's position.

Far better would it be if, for the future, the masculine youth of the day had their ideas of feminine power and worth heightened, instead of, from early boyhood, by school associations and classical quotations, lowered. Boys are quick to perceive the footing on which women are placed; they are aware of the vow of obedience, even twit their mothers and sisters with it, and young men are heard to describe the treatment they intend to adopt to future wives should they "dispute their will." Thus, women start handicapped in the race with those they would lead and influence, and thus from their childhood are they seared with the brand of inferiority, before they have had a chance of showing what their powers are.

We believe that marriage would be a very much better and higher thing if men were taught from their early days that women ought to be their companions and equals, and were not led to suppose themselves able, and to have a right, to make wives after their own pattern. In this delusion men marry a pretty face or a fortune, for their own amusement or convenience, and do not look beneath the surface to see if tastes correspond, or to ask themselves if they are doing justly to the beings they request to make a sacrifice of their all at their shrines. It is because uneducated women cannot be companions to educated men that the latter seek companionship away from home,

leaving wives to find the same as they can. It has, indeed, till quite lately, been considered that politics and literature are beyond a woman's province, and that she is to be talked down to like a child. What wonder that many a wife who wishes to have communion of spirit, as well as of body, with her husband, has, feeling herself shut out from all high and pure fellowship, in disgust and disappointment, thrown herself into dissipation, folly, and extravagance, and that the home of many a man has been ruined by his own selfishness and blindness.

Partaking, as they do, in the education of the day, women can no longer consent to be treated as being merely on a level with their children; for them, as well as for men, there has through the centuries been a training for freedom, and they claim, instead of remaining stunted, warped, or weak growths, overshadowed by the foliage of their male protectors, to be allowed the free and full development of whatever may be the special or individual natures they severally possess. If women are inferior to men, the latter need entertain no fear: only the worthless of their sex will be elbowed aside in the race; the knowledge that the superiority of manhood can no longer stand by assertion, but that the appreciation of the other sex must be won by high and noble living and doing, will have a salutary effect on the rising generation. If, on the contrary, women are found more equal to men than has been generally supposed, what can be said of the injustice that has so long handicapped them? Women wish to become the companions of men, but while ignorant, unappreciated, despised, they can never do so. The aim of both men and women should be to complete each other. If progress is to be real, man and woman must go forth hand in hand along its paths, and, together, must raise the standard of love and of dignity, which can be steadfastly maintained only when fixed on the firm basis of mutual respect.

N. ARLING.

MIRACLES.

I. MIRACLES AND NATURAL CAUSES.

THE question of the truth concerning miracles is one that is becoming every day more engrossing. It is no longer one which is only debated by philosophers and scholars, but is now a high scholastic or theological question, it is one in which the religious public generally are now deeply interested in. It has come down to the people. It is no longer considered atheistic to question the reality of supernatural events, it is done daily by devout and pious people who have no desire to relinquish religion or abandon the Christian name. It is felt by them that there does not appear to be any necessary connection between the stories of miraculous events and spirituality of mind; at the same time the old impression that in some way they are linked together still survives, and many religious people do not know what to do with them. They have been taught to believe that the evidence for miracles is overwhelming and inseparable from the reality of religion, and they fear that if they abandon a general acceptance of this evidence they must forfeit their share in the diviner influence of religion. This they are naturally reluctant to do, so that while in spite of themselves they are forced to suppress their doubts, they suffer from a divided mind and cannot find intellectual peace.

Although this article is devoted principally to the consideration of miracles in general and their alleged utility, rather than to a recapitulation of particular objections to them, it will be unavoidable to discuss some objections to miracles in themselves. The principal aim we have in view is to show as far as we are able that the strength of religion does not depend upon this its weakest link. The apologists for miracles exhibit the weakness of their case by the constant shifting of their ground of defence, and by their disagreement among themselves. Cardinal Newman, Archbishop Trench, and Dr. Samuel Cox may be considered the best modern advocates of the miraculous in religion, though there is no common understanding between them. Dr. Cox explicitly says, in presenting his case: "Our modern sceptics, at least on the scientific side, so far as they condescend to argue with us, are content to ignore the last and most generous reading, and to carry themselves as though the Roman or the Puritan, the sacerdotal or the Calvinistic interpretation of

the Biblical documents were all they had to meet.”¹ In answer to this it may be said that the inquirer properly at first gives his attention to the interpretation which claims the highest authority, which is most ancient and which is most widely proffered. And it may seem to the critic that the Catholic doctrine of miracles is more rational, in so far as it is more consistent, than the new scientific argument.

One difficulty with Protestants has always been the question, why and when did miracles cease? The Catholic declares his belief that they have never ceased, that the power of working miracles has been committed to the Church, and that some ecclesiastical miracles are as authentic as some scriptural ones. “What has happened once may happen again,” says Newman, an admission which neither Trench nor Cox seemed prepared to make. Further, Newman points out that many scriptural miracles are no better, that is, belong to no higher class, than ecclesiastical ones. Such as the cures wrought by Christ’s garments, or Paul’s handkerchief, or Peter’s shadow, and the miracles wrought by Elijah’s mantle and Elisha’s bones. If one set of such miracles are founded upon fact, why not others?

Again, there is a wide difference between Newman and Trench in their demonology, and, strange to say, the Catholic is here more cautious than the Protestant. Newman’s conclusions may be gathered from a few sentences: ‘Such are the supposed effects of witchcraft and of magical charms, which profess to originate with spirits and demons; for as these agents, supposing them to exist, did not make the world, there is every reason for thinking they cannot alter its arrangements.’² “Hence the claims to supernatural power in the primitive Church are in general questionable as resting upon the exorcism of evil spirits and the cure of diseases, works not only less satisfactory than others, as evidence of a miraculous interposition, but suspicious, from the circumstance that they were exhibited also by Jews and Gentiles of the same age.”³ “The exorcism of demoniacs, however, has already been noticed as being, perhaps in every case, deficient in the proof of its miraculous nature.”⁴ Still, with these great reservations he admits, “Yet on the authority of Scripture we admit the occasional interference of agents short of divine with the course of nature.”⁵

Trench goes to far greater length than this in his demonology; in his notes on the stilling of the tempest, he says that Christ “rebuking” the storm is not a mere oratorical personification, “but a distinct tracing up of all the discords and disharmonies in the outward world to their source in a person, and referring them back to him, as to their ultimate ground, even as this person can be no other

¹ *Miracles: an Argument and a Challenge*, p. 137.

² *Essay on Miracles*, p. 27. ³ *Ibid.*, p. 32.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 45.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 68.

than Satan, the author of all disorders alike in the natural and spiritual world. The Lord elsewhere 'rebukes' a fever when the same remarks hold good."¹

This would countenance the belief, so widely held in the Middle Ages, that thunder and lightning, hail and pestilence, were due to the direct interference of Satan. He carries his demonology much further than cases of possession, and makes a statement, much less guarded than Newman. The mere appearance of a miracle cannot be regarded as evidence of divine interposition.² "For side by side with the miracles which serve for the furthering of the kingdom of God runs another line of wonders, the counterworkings of him who is ever the ape of the Most High; who has still his caricatures of the Holiest. . . . For that Scripture attributes real wonders to him there seems to me to be no manner of doubt. The Egyptian magicians, his servants, stood in relation to a spiritual kingdom as truly as did Moses and Aaron."

The importance of demonology to Trench's argument cannot be overrated, as to him diabolical and demoniacal interference rest upon as good authority as divine. Indeed, the divine interference, as in the case of possession, would not be called for had there not been a previous demoniacal one. The whole system is linked to the supernatural cause of the fall of man. "For the destinies of the natural world were linked to the destinies of man, and when he fell, he drew after him his whole inheritance, which became subject to the same vanity."³ And the miracles of the multiplication of the loaves and fishes and the turning water into wine were only solitary instances of what might have been a universal law if the devil had never enticed man to disobedience. Demonology is inseparable from a belief in miracles, and if one is not prepared to accept it entire it is impossible to find a place for miracles in the supernatural economy. The supposed interference of demons with the course of Nature is nevertheless the merest assumption, as the origin of tempests, earthquakes, and pestilences is sufficiently explained by natural causes. The only instance demanding a moment's attention is the phenomenon sometimes known as possession and its natural sequence, exorcism. But possession is also completely accounted for by the undoubted fact of the occurrence of mental maladies, and even of mental epidemics for which it is not necessary to seek any supernatural explanation. The account of many of these given by Hecker in his *Epidemics of the Middle Ages*, throws a strong light upon the demonology of the New Testament and the early Church. Mental excitement is capable of producing effects upon its victims which are not necessarily dependent upon physical causes. There may be physical predisposition, but the disturbance attributed to

¹ *The Miracles of our Lord*, p. 156.

² *Ibid.*, p. 24.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 35.

demons is generated by a mental irritation. Sympathy and imagination are capable of producing the most extraordinary effects, not only upon the mind but also upon the body of man. The Dancing Mania described by Hecker is one of the largest illustrations of this principle. In Italy, at Apuleia, the bite of the tarantula spider was believed to be most deadly in its effects, and the danger could only be averted by the patients giving themselves up to the most violent exercises in the way of leaping and dancing until, sinking from sheer exhaustion, the poison was supposed to be dissipated. That this was due more to the effect of imagination than to the bite of the tarantula there can be no doubt. But further than that, persons who were not even bitten, but only imagined they were, experienced the same disorders; the force of imagination could no further go.

Hecker gives many instances of other disorders provoked by mental excitement which have every appearance of the phenomenon known at other times as possession. The *Convulsionnaires* in France is a striking instance. These manifestations took place at the tomb of Abbé Pâris, in the cemetery of St. Medard. "Patients were seized with convulsions and tetanic spasms, rolled upon the ground like persons possessed, were thrown into violent contortions of their heads and limbs, and suffered the greatest oppression, accompanied by quickness and irregularity of pulse." This was attributed by the followers of the Abbé to divine influence, while the Ultramontanists interpreted it as a work of Satan. The excitement continually grew worse and the symptoms more severe, and this lasted openly for fifty-nine years, until 1790, and was still surviving in secret as late as 1828; similar disturbances occurred amongst the English Methodists in Cornwall and elsewhere, and in the great camp meeting revivals in North America, and the subjects of these excitements exhibit many of the symptoms related of those possessed of demons in the New Testament. Many other illustrations might be given. The question is not, do these things occur? There can be no doubt about that, but from what causes do they spring; are they possession, or do they arise from a contagious mental excitement? It appears that if men believe themselves to be possessed it has the same actual effect upon them as if they really were possessed, they fling away all self-control, and abandon themselves to the wildest extravagances. Exorcism is to be explained in the same way: those who believe in possession, as a natural consequence believe in exorcism, and yield to the influence of the exorcist as readily as they had previously yielded to the other illusion.

The only other series of miracles we shall touch upon in this division is that of the plagues brought upon the Egyptians by the word of Moses. The only thing actually miraculous here is not the plagues themselves, which may have arisen from natural, if not well

understood, causes, but the alleged power of Moses to bring them about. The only explanation of this, which appears to be a sufficient one, is that it was invented at a later date. The only rational way of coming to an understanding of the historical books of the Old Testament is by accepting the fact that they were written in their present form long after the events related had occurred, and that a religious and sometimes supernatural colouring was given to them in accordance with the prevailing spirit of the time. A divine origin was attributed to all their religious and legal institutions, and a miraculous source alleged for many purely natural occurrences. If the constantly recurring formula in the Book of Leviticus, "and the Lord spake unto Moses," is omitted, the laws will appear to be, as they undoubtedly are, merely human enactments. In other cases, if the supposed miraculous cause of many of the most striking events is dropped, it will be found that there is nothing in them but what has often occurred elsewhere. It is contended that the miracle is not always in the event but in some coincidence, which is just the one thing it is impossible to prove, and is also the one thing that was most easily invented. To take the plagues of Egypt out of their setting is easy, and when so treated there is nothing found that cannot be paralleled in other times and countries.¹ "All the waters that were in the river were turned into blood, and the fish that was in the river died; and the river stank, and the Egyptians could not drink water from the river, and the blood was throughout all the land of Egypt. And frogs came up and covered the land of Egypt, and there were lice upon man and beast; and there came grievous swarms of flies, the land was corrupted because of the swarms of flies. And all the cattle died, a boil breaking forth with blains upon man and beast; and there was hail and flashing continually amidst the hail, very grievous, such as had not been in all the land of Egypt since it became a nation. And the east wind brought the locusts, they covered the face of the whole earth so that the land was darkened; and they did eat every herb of the land and all the fruit of the trees which the hail had left, and there was a thick darkness in all the land of Egypt three days. And the Lord smote all the first-born of Egypt, there was not a house where there was not one dead" (Exodus viii.-xii.). This is a terrible picture of the pestilence with its attendant circumstances. The circumstances may indeed be regarded with something more than probability as the cause of the pestilence. There is not a circumstance described which cannot be paralleled with those which attended the outbreaks of various plagues in Europe in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The subject was fully investigated by Hecker, who gave the result of his researches

¹ "Under the reign of King Semempses, a number of miracles were observed and a violent plague gave the black death to all around."—Brugsch-Bey: *Egypt under the Pharaohs*, vol. i. p. 60.

in a series of remarkable monographs on the *Epidemics of the Middle Ages*, to which reference has already been made. He only states the facts as he found them—the comparison with the Egyptian plagues suggests itself:—

“Of rarer occurrence, but quite as important to the general tendencies of life, are the luxuriant growths of the minutest cryptogamic plants in the water, and on damp things of all kinds, which from their spots of various forms and colours produced the utmost horror both before and during great pestilences, they excited superstitious fears as appearing to be something miraculous. These spots (*signacula*), and especially the blood-spots, were seen at a very early period. A historian (Mezeray) who speaks also of blood-rain, recounts that they could not be got rid of in less than ten or twelve days, and that they frequently occurred in closed chests on linen and on articles of clothing.”¹

It is important to notice that Exodus says that the blood was not only in the river, but on all the land of Egypt. With regard to insects Hecker says: “A very considerable flight of caterpillars, which in the north of Germany stripped the gardens and woods far and wide of their foliage, deserves to be here mentioned as a phenomenon appertaining to the lower grades of the animal kingdom. Natural history has shown that occurrences of this kind are by no means occasioned by new and wonderful influences, but rather by unusual combinations of circumstances, appearing to occur together almost accidentally at a given time, especially the simultaneous union of warmth and humidity in the atmosphere, whereby sometimes one and sometimes another of the lower grades of animal existences becomes extraordinarily developed. Swarms of locusts have appeared before and during most great pestilences.”² Violent storms³ and thick and often stinking fogs⁴ were almost invariable predecessors of an outbreak of plague. Fishes, birds, and cattle were attacked with disease, and it follows that a set of pestiferous influences was thus created that must be deadly to the human frame. The resemblance of these occurrences time after time in Europe naturally provokes scepticism of the miraculous origin of an exactly similar set of circumstances in Egypt. Hecker himself makes no reference to Exodus in his comparison between mediæval and ancient epidemics. There is one more, and that the most important, point upon which he throws some light. The exemption of the Israelites and exceptional mortality of young Egyptians. During the outbreak of petechial fever in Italy in 1506, Hecker says, “women seldom died of this fever, elderly people still more rarely, and Jews scarcely ever. Young people, on the other hand, died in great numbers, and especially from among the higher ranks.”⁵

¹ Hecker, *Epidemics of Middle Ages*, translated by B. G. Babington, M.D., F.R.S., &c., p. 190. Trübner, 1859.

² *Ibid.*, p. 189.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 233.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 13.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 186.

The tendency of pestilences not only to attack certain classes, but also to confine themselves to certain races, is curiously illustrated in the English sweating sickness. "The very remarkable observation was made, in this year (1552) that the sweating sickness uniformly spared foreigners in England, and on the other hand followed the English into foreign countries. We cannot get rid of the notion that there was some peculiarity in the whole constitution of the English which rendered them exclusively susceptible of this disease."¹

These occurrences, strange as they may seem but well attested, throw some light upon the statement that only young Egyptians succumbed to the pestilence, and that the Israelites were untouched by it. Some climatic conditions may also have contributed to the localization of the plague. There does not appear to be any necessity to bring in miraculous interference to account for the plagues of Egypt, or for the exemption of Goshen and the Israelites; though it is easy to understand how in after-times they became associated with a belief in the supernatural gifts of Moses. That these occurrences too may have coincided with the Exodus, or that the Exodus followed close upon them, is very likely. They would probably so demoralize, if not absolutely weaken the Egyptians, as to give the children of the bondage the opportunity they had long sought to make their escape from their oppressors.

II. MIRACLES AND SCIENCE.

Science knows nothing about miracles, not because it is prejudiced against them or because it considers them antecedently impossible, but because it can never have an opportunity of investigating them. An event which is exceptional, unexpected and isolated, can never be the subject of a scientific test. As a rule, also, miracles are the subject of hearsay, they are not vouched for by competent eye-witnesses, but are recorded by persons to whom they were subsequently related. There is not sufficient evidence to engage the attention of scientific men; and before a scientific man can be expected to conduct an investigation into the causes of an unusual occurrence he must have satisfactory proof that the event actually transpired, and that all the circumstances were exactly as related.

Yet while miracles are becoming day by day more discredited, honest attempts are made to find new explanations for them which shall not contradict the general scientific spirit of the time. One of the most popular of these attempts is the little work on *Miracles, an Argument and a Challenge*, by Samuel Cox, D.D., in which he has summed up the latest and most rational explanations

¹ Hecker, pp. 272, 273.

that the defenders of the miraculous have to offer. This in itself constitutes a fresh objection, that the ground on which miracles are defended is constantly shifting, though it can hardly be said that the objections have ever altered. The objections may be embraced under two heads—the antecedent improbability of miracles and the un-historic character of the narratives of them. The second objection is weightier than the first. There is a third objection which has not so often been pressed, and that is, their insufficiency as a basis of religion, to which a part of this article will be devoted.

It may be useful at first to subject Dr. Cox's argument to a somewhat detailed examination which in itself may prove a sufficient answer to his challenge. It appears that Dr. Cox considers his argument an unanswerable challenge to scientific men, and appeals to them to meet it if they can. We do not intend to attempt to answer it, only in general terms, upon a scientific ground, as it appears to us that his premisses are so unsound that a Biblical or literary criticism is first needed, and that when this is applied there is nothing left for scientific men to reply to. He first treats of the "original miracle." This is actually a question as to the origin of things, about which no scientific man has yet any dogmatic statement to make. Science is busy at present dealing with the method of creation, and offers no explanation as to the cause. But whatever the cause it has nothing to do with Dr. Cox's challenge, for no explanation or theory of the origin of things has any bearing upon the stories of miracles, the truth of which he wishes to maintain. It is conceded by scientific men that the origin of matter and force, the origin of life, the origin of consciousness, and the origin of moral consciousness are as yet unsolved problems. But there is no relation between these mysteries and the Biblical stories of miracles. The argument appears to be this, that if God could do the greater works, is it not possible also that He could do the lesser ones? The question is not what might have happened, but what did happen. Whether miracles are antecedently impossible or incredible is a matter of opinion, but whether they actually occurred is a matter for proof. There can be no doubt about the facts of matter, life, and consciousness; but there are all sorts of doubts whether Aaron's rod changed into a serpent, whether the iron axe-head ever floated, or whether the water was instantaneously converted into wine.

Another pseudo-scientific argument is applied at length in chapter ii. :—

"Now so long as the Church conceived of miracles as violations of the laws of Nature, it was very natural, and even reasonable, that sceptics should declare miracles to be impossible; for how should God transgress his own laws? Or how can any purely physical law be broken? But now that the Church conceives of miracles as modifi-

cations of the ordinary course of Nature, induced by the coming in of a higher force acting on a higher law, sceptics no longer pronounce miracles to be impossible, but still declare them to be incredible. How can they pronounce them to be impossible when even they themselves possess and wield a power by which the ordinary course of Nature is constantly modified and overruled? When, to use a familiar illustration, I fling a stone into the air, I do not violate the law of gravitation, I simply modify, and to a certain extent override, its action by bringing a new force into play, that of my own will. The intelligence and will of man have changed the face of the whole earth."¹

The fallacy here is apparent. In throwing a stone into the air, if we may be said to modify or override the force of gravitation, it is not done by the will, but by the application of muscular force: one physical force for the time resisting and interfering with another physical force, both of them equally subject to the laws of Nature. The question is not, can one physical force be overcome by another physical force? but can a physical force be modified or overruled by the will, without the intervention of another physical force? Of this Dr. Cox can give us no instance. "The intelligence and will of man have changed the face of the whole earth." How? By physical force. "By hewing down forests, by ploughing and draining fields, by laying down roads, &c."² There is nothing analogous to miracles here. Yet he returns to his *non sequitur*--"but if the will of man has so largely modified the action of these forces, who can doubt that the will of God might, should He for some worthy end think fit, modify it much more widely, subtly, and potently?" The argument therefore is simply the illogical one, that if man can make physical changes by the application of physical force directed by his will, why cannot God make physical changes by His will without the application of physical force? We do not therefore think a sceptic would make the admission which follows. "No," says the modern sceptic, "miracles are not impossible, if by miracles you mean simply a modification of the natural order by the introduction of a supernatural force, and if I admit that any such supernatural force exists."

The supposed proof lies in the unjustifiable substitution of "supernatural" force in one part of the argument for the admitted "physical" force in the other part. Because men generally have made great natural changes by "hewing down forests," therefore we are asked to believe that on one occasion Jesus destroyed a fig-tree by an act of will without the use of physical force. This can hardly be said to be an argument worth the notice of scientific men.

III. OLD TESTAMENT MIRACLES.

Having settled the scientific probability of miracles in this unsatisfactory manner, Dr. Cox proceeds to a rationalistic defence of the miracles of the Bible, and here we are on ground for which no special scientific knowledge is necessary. We are in the region of Biblical criticism and theology. The query is proposed that if miracles are incredible, how is it that they are affirmed in the Bible by men who seem to be honest and competent witnesses, and that they cannot be disentangled from its theology and morality; the theology being the highest and the morality the purest the world has ever seen? But this is the question at issue, Can the theology and morality be disentangled from the miraculous stories? Not only can they, but they must; men find daily that the stories of miracles are more and more untrustworthy, but this cannot dim the beauty of the moral sentiments or diminish the excellence of the theology which happen to be included within the covers of the same book. If the theology satisfies man's religious instincts, and the morality commends itself to his moral sense, he will cherish them for their own sakes, though he may have to discard the legends which here and there are associated with them. If we find consolation in the words, "The Lord is my shepherd, I shall not want," or, "But thou, O Lord, art a God full of compassion and gracious, slow to anger and plenteous in mercy and truth," must we also believe that when the people of Israel murmured at Taberah that the anger of the Lord was kindled against them and the fire of the Lord devoured them? If we are stirred by the morality of Isaiah lviii., must we also believe that Uzzah was struck dead for touching the ark? There is nothing in common between the highest theology and morality of the Bible and its legends and myths. It does not follow that there was anything in common between the different writers, or that the men who gave utterance to some of the psalms and prophecies were the same men who collected the legends of miracles, or attributed vengeance and fury to their Deity. But even if it were so, if the same author at one time gave expression to the highest religious and moral sentiments and at another time honestly related absurd and incredible stories, it would neither prove the truth of the stories nor diminish the value of the teaching. If Dr. Cox hesitates to admit this, let us remind him that instances are not scarce to-day in which venerable teachers belonging to the Roman Catholic Church enunciate sentiments of religion and morality as high and pure and true as man has ever done, and yet believe and accredit supernatural stories which Dr. Cox would deem incredible. Cannot the same argument be applied to the writers of the Old and New Testaments?

It is contended that the Bible stories are not of the nature of myths and legends which we find in the early history of every race. Myths they may not be, but legends they probably are. It would be, generally speaking, inaccurate to describe a miracle as a myth, as the word is used to denote the personification of natural phenomena or impersonal emotions. Moses might be a mythical personage, though it is generally admitted that he is not, that there is some historic basis for the story of his life; but then the stories of supernatural power employed by him may none the less be unhistoric and legendary.

Legends, we are told by Dr. Cox, are fabulous inventions with which every race glorifies its own origin, its founders, and heroes; but he also asserts that the Mosaic legends, while having one mark in common with ordinary national legends—that is, they are associated with the origin of a nation—do not glorify either Moses or the men he redeemed from bondage. It is an unsupported assertion that all legends have that tendency. We shall try to show presently that theological legends may have another purpose, but at the same time these Mosaic legends are not altogether without this common mark. The effect of them is to glorify the origin of the nation, and more especially, and this in common with some later legends, the Deity of the nation. The wonder-working controversy between Moses and the Egyptian magicians is to demonstrate the superiority of the Deity whose servant Moses is. The miracles which are selected at the commission of Moses—the staff turned into a serpent, and the leprous hand—are quoted as showing that they tell rather against the greatness of Moses than for it; but they tell indirectly for it, as they are to be the signs to others of the supernatural power with which he was invested. And so with the miracles in the wilderness, though they do not contribute anything to the character of the ancestors of the Israelites, they have the reflected glory, which to them is much greater than any personal one, that they were the chosen subjects of Jehovah's miraculous preservation, or even of His miraculously manifested anger.

But there is another tendency in theological stories of miracles as differing from patriotic legends: they frequently have a moral or hortatory purpose. The prophet-historian is writing for the instruction or warning of his contemporaries, and ancient stories assume a shape calculated to produce a moral impression.

"The miracles of the wilderness almost without exception tell to the shame, not to the honour, of the men who, in the language of some of their own poets, there saw God, tempted Him, and proved His work. . . Forty years long was He grieved with them, and provoked, working miracles only to still their murmuring, to repair their mistakes, to rebuke their sins."¹ We get a side-light on this

¹ Cox, p. 54.

from St. Paul, 1 Cor. x.: "Neither let us commit fornication, as some of them committed, and fell in one day three and twenty thousand; neither let us tempt the Lord as some of them tempted, and perished by serpents; neither murmur ye as some of them murmured, and perished by the destroyer. Now these things happened unto them by way of example, and they were written for our admonition." This is not history, but exhortation. Paul only adopted a method which had been in use amongst the Jews for centuries; we cannot literally believe that all these tremendous calamities happened for an example to the early Christians, or that if they ever happened they were occasioned by the special sins enumerated. These same stories had been used in the same way for hundreds of years, and what is more likely than that they had their origin, or at least took their colouring, from the same theological cast of mind?

Is it then to be said that priestly exhorters ever invented stories which they knew not to be true, in order to induce religious obedience? There is nothing improbable even in that; we shall find what looks like a very decided instance of it as we proceed, but generally it is possible to admit the historic nature of the event recorded. It is the miraculous cause and religious intention that provoke a doubt. If there was a place known at the time of writing (Numbers xi.) as Taberah—that is, Burnings—the people might ask, why was it so called? and the answer would be, because there the camp was burnt. And why was the camp burnt? because the people murmured. Thus we see how, in the hands of priestly historians, natural events could receive a theological and miraculous complexion. The stories of the burnt camp, the serpent-bitten and plague-stricken people, might have some foundation in fact; but the explanation no doubt came long afterwards. This would account for the peculiarity noticed by Dr. Cox of the connection in the narrative between the miracles in the wilderness and the sins of the people. One is also led to infer the legendary nature of the Mosaic miracles from Moses' contest with the Egyptian magicians; up to a certain point they are as powerful as Moses, but in the end he is shown to be possessed of superior power. Aaron cast down his rod before Pharaoh, and it became a serpent. Lo! a miracle! say the theologians. But the magicians did the same with their enchantments. What is that? Secret or black art! But where is the difference? Aaron must be declared the superior, so his rod swallowed up all the other rods. Is not that like a fable? Several contests follow in which the magicians imitate Aaron, but at length their attempts fail, and Aaron's rod proved itself victorious all along the line. Does not this look like a legend which glorifies the ancestors of a people? Which is the most probable explanation of stories like these, that they illustrate "the

coming in of a higher force acting upon a higher law," or that they are fabulous?

Proceeding to an examination of the miracles attributed to Moses generally, we shall be confirmed in this view. In what way do these stories reveal the will of God or contribute to the glory of religion? To appreciate the answer to this question it is necessary to consider the quality of these miracles. Are they of such a character and have they such a purpose as to impress us with their divine origin? We have already referred to the serpent-rod and the plagues of Egypt. We next come to the dividing of the Red Sea, but here the historian himself introduces a secondary cause—God caused a strong east wind to blow all night, and drive the sea back; so here we have no incoming of a higher force, but simply the force of the wind temporarily overcoming the force of the water.¹ The only other stories of miraculous interference with the course of Nature are the sweetening of the bitter waters, the falling of manna, and the two occasions upon which Moses drew water from the rock. These surely are very slender materials out of which to construct a theory of higher forces and higher laws. The remaining wonders are of a suspicious character, being associated either with religious disobedience or with party interests. These are the burning of the camp at Taberah, the burning of Nadab and Abihu for offering strange fire, the earthquake which swallowed Korah and his companions, and the budding of Aaron's rod, which is part of the same incident. If ever there was a story with a purpose this appears to be one. The relations of the Levites to the priesthood may be difficult to clear up, but this story avowedly relates to a contention as to the position of the inferior and superior priesthood. It is an unseemly wrangle, which is terminated by Moses and Aaron silencing their opponents, in the most effective manner, by means of an earthquake.

Korah and his companions appear before Moses and say, "Ye take too much upon you, seeing all the congregation are holy, every one of them, and the Lord is among them; wherefore then lift ye up yourselves above the assembly of the Lord?" And Moses said unto Korah, "Hear now, ye sons of Levi: seemeth it but a small thing unto you that the God of Israel hath separated you from the congregation of Israel, to bring you near to himself, to do the service of the tabernacle of the Lord, and to stand before the congregation and to minister unto them; and that he hath brought you near, and all thy brethren, the sons of Levi, with thee? *And seek ye the priesthood also!*"

It surely does not need much knowledge of history and priests to lead one to suspect that the whole story arose out of a controversy of a very much later date.

¹ What is probably the correct account of this event is given by Brugsch-Bey in *The Exodus and the Egyptian Monuments*.

IV. THE PERIODIC THEORY.

It is time to turn to the general theory of Biblical miracles upon which Dr. Cox relies for his main support. The method is one of a broad and comparatively new generalization; that is, to take them as a whole and formulate a law from a certain uniformity in the circumstances attending their alleged occurrence. This method is perfectly legitimate if the premisses are sound, but no weakness in the particulars can be overcome by the plausibility of the generalization. Each instance ought to be substantiated before it can add anything to the support of the general hypothesis.

Dr. Cox presumes that the story of Biblical miracles as he has formulated it will awaken some surprise. The theory is this: "When we see that its miracles group themselves in three periods far removed from each other, and cluster round three events of prime importance—viz., the inception of the national life, the advent of the prophetic power, and the redemption from the Babylonian captivity, we begin to get glimpses of a certain divine purpose, a certain divine order and propriety in them."¹

This places a clear issue before us, as it is not difficult to examine a theory so lucidly and concisely stated. But the conclusion to which we are led must depend upon the correctness of the general statement, the historical support of each group, and the accuracy of the chronology. In the first place the mythical, the supernatural, and the miraculous are not thus systematically distributed. They are said to happen at the times referred to, but there are other instances which have to be put on one side in order to make the theory complete.

"We are met," says this author, "by this most remarkable fact, that from the creation of the world down to the call of Moses, a period of 2500 years, the laws of Nature hold on the even tenor of their way unbroken by a single interruption, although these twenty-five centuries, since they are the earliest in the human story, ought, according to the mythical hypothesis, to be the richest in tales of wonders."

But if we are thus permitted to class myths and miracles together this statement does not hold good, as these twenty-five centuries, passing by the exploded chronology, are full of myths, or accounts of supernatural intervention in human affairs, which are, in Dr. Cox's sense, miraculous. There are the temptation and fall of Adam and Eve, the expulsion from Eden, the mark of Cain, the taking up of Enoch, and the flood; the flood is attributed to secondary causes, but the foretelling to Noah and the preservation of himself and family and the animals in the ark belong as much to the miraculous as

¹ *Miracles*, p. 61.

any events can. After the flood there is the birth of Isaac, a distinct modification of natural law, the divine intervention on behalf of Isaac on Mount Moriah, the angelic visits to Abraham and Jacob, the destruction of Lot's wife, &c. So it can hardly be said that these twenty-five centuries are destitute of tales of wonder. Joshua may be included in the Mosaic period, and as the "minister and successor" of Moses works miracles like his great predecessor; though generally less importance is attached to them. Under his leadership the people pass through the Jordan on dry ground in the same manner that their fathers crossed the Red Sea, and the walls of Jericho miraculously fall down.¹

From Joshua to Elijah we are told that "the display of miraculous power begins to decline, and for a period of six centuries we meet with only a dubious miracle here and there."² But if some miracles are dubious, why not all? Are we to doubt miracles when they are scarce and believe them when they are plentiful?

We are thus brought to the second miraculous period, that of Elijah. "At a period so late, and in a light so clear as to leave little scope for legend, we find marvels as numerous as ever and as wonderful." Notwithstanding this opinion, it is generally accepted that much related of Elijah and Elisha is of a legendary character, and that late as the period was the literary and historic age did not begin till about a century later, leaving ample time for legendary accretions to the historic basis. As to the miracles being numerous in the case of Elijah, they amount to just six, and some of those related of Elisha are duplicates of those attributed to his master. But the non-importance of the miraculous stories is conceded by Dr. Cox, and his argument comes in the end to the support of our proposition, that miracles do not contribute anything to the greatness of religious men. "Nor, again, is it to his miracles that Elijah owes his grandeur, and the larger and heroic proportions he assumes in our thoughts; but to his character, to his indomitable courage, his passionate loyalty and devotion. Just as Elisha stands in our imagination as the type of all that is sweet, genial, and gracious in the man of God, not because he did many mighty works, but because his works, like those of one greater than himself, were works of mercy and compassion."³

According to this view, we may dispense with the incredible stories of miracles, and neither the history nor the men will lose

¹ In the *Queen's Printers' Aids to the Student of the Bible* (p. 136) we read that in the year 1451 B.C., "Our Lord Jesus, Captain of his Father's Host, appears to Joshua, the typical Jesus, before Jericho, with a drawn sword in his hand, and promiseth there to defend his people." Is not this a myth founded upon a myth? In Joshua ii. 13, we read of the appearance of a man with a drawn sword, entirely in the nature of a myth, but this is further developed into a Messianic myth by the editor of the *Aids*, which shows that the tendency to create myths is not confined to an early stage in human history, but belongs to a certain class of minds in all ages.

² Cox, p. 56.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 59.

anything by the change ; they would rather gain, as the supernatural stories only give an air of unreality to what otherwise would be grand and heroic figures and times.

The next episode chosen to illustrate the periodic theory is the most dubious of all, as competent critics have long since decided upon its unhistoric character. That is the Book of Daniel with its marvellous stories of divine interposition. At Babylon in the days of the captivity, we are told, the miraculous energy breaks out once more, and Daniel and his compeers are so visibly guarded and taught by heaven as to assure the captives that God remembers them, and to constrain the Persian conqueror to unloose their chains.

But what becomes of all this if the view taken by many critics is the correct one, that the Book of Daniel was written in the times of the Maccabees, and for the people of those times, and described in fictitious forms the actual condition of things transpiring under the writer's eyes, who by the use of strong figures and imaginary episodes sought to encourage his countrymen in their resistance to the Grecian rule, and to support them in their endurance of the terrible sufferings they had to bear if they remained faithful to their own religion ? The Book of Daniel agrees in incident and spirit with the Maccabean age, and has nothing in common with the men and days of the captivity. It must therefore be put on one side, and with this important contribution to the periodic theory removed the whole of the edifice must fall to the ground. For what is there to offer for the consideration of scientific men if the accumulating testimony of historical investigation leads us to the conclusion that the miracles of Moses, Elijah, and Daniel are not instances of "a higher force acting upon a higher law," but that they never occurred ?

The consideration of the relation of miracles to Christianity deserves a separate article, but so far as it is connected with the general argument something needs to be said in this place. After what has been said about the time of the composition of the Book of Daniel, the reference to the four hundred years between the Restoration and the Advent, and the statement that during that time no miracle is recorded, and the voice of prophecy is dumb, lose their weight, and the series—Moses, Elijah, Daniel, Jesus—cannot be maintained.

The Christian miracles are said to be destitute of every mark of a legendary and mythical origin. This identification of myth and legend is again confusing, as one may admit the absence of myth while believing in the presence of legend.

"Myths belong to the earlier stages of history ; but this was the last stage in the national history of the Jews. Myths tend to glorify a race or the great men of a race, but the Jews rejected him to whom these miracles are ascribed."¹

¹ Dr. Cox, p. 66.

If these were Jewish legends the argument might have some weight, but they are Christian legends, and the national history of the Jews has no bearing upon the subject; when referred to the Christians they have the marks which are said to be legendary. They relate to the earliest stage of the rise of Christianity, and they tend to glorify the persons earliest associated with it. We are further asked to accept the evidence for the Christian miracles, on the ground that it was not a credulous age. But it must be admitted that this has nothing to do with scepticism; that after the death of the Apostles and for centuries later the stories of miracles were continually on the increase, and for a thousand years or more fresh supernatural stories were universally believed. Admit it was a sceptical age, it does not follow that those who recorded the miracles had imbibed the sceptical spirit. The age of Voltaire was a sceptical age, yet it was during it the alleged miracles occurred at the tomb of Abbé Pâris. This is a sceptical age, but many nineteenth century miracles find acceptance with large numbers of people. Marvels happen to the credulous in all ages.

WALTER LLOYD.

NATURALISM.

THE scientific spirit of the present age has had a peculiar influence on literature. It is to this spirit that we owe the substitution of analysis for pure narrative in the novel, and of scenes in everyday life for exciting situations in the drama. In France, the literary movement which owes its impulse to science has received a characteristic name: it is described as *le Naturalisme*. In England, the naturalistic method has only been adopted by a few novelists, whose productions have been the subject of exceedingly severe criticism, and who—if we may use here a word begotten of the Irish agrarian struggle,—have been “boycotted” by all the circulating libraries. Indeed, some English critics have, in the most perfect good faith, execrated Naturalism, apparently regarding it as something radically immoral and infamous. Thus, in an article which appeared about four years ago in the *Fortnightly Review*, from the pen of Mr. W. S. Lilly,¹ we are told that Naturalism is the lowest form of materialism, and that it owes its origin to the depraved tastes of some French writers of fiction. Mr. Lilly, in support of his rather sweeping statements, quotes passages from a work by M. Zola, entitled *Le Roman Expérimental*, and emphasizes the fact that the avowed object of the French novelist is to portray *la bête humaine*.

It is rather amusing to find that, in England, M. Zola is looked upon as the creator of Naturalism, the truth being that he is only one of a long series of writers, some of whom flourished more than a century ago. Looking at the matter broadly, we think it would be tolerably correct to say that Balzac was the first French novelist of the naturalistic school. In *Le Père Goriot* and *Eugénie Grandet* we have two works of fiction in which real life is reproduced with marvellous effect. Balzac saw that imaginary portraits of men and women had no vitality, and that the basis of a novel should be truth. Accordingly, he exercised his rare powers of observation to an extraordinary degree, and wrote books that must live, because they depict human nature accurately.

It may be asked, What is Naturalism? Let us go to M. Zola, the supposed father of French Naturalism, for an answer. “Naturalism,” he says, “is the formula of modern science applied to literature. It is the analytic and experimental method. When you

¹ “The New Naturalism,” *Fortnightly Review* for August, 1885.

apply this method, you are naturalistic, irrespective of your style. Stendhal is a naturalist, just as Balzac is, and certainly the dry manner of the former has little resemblance to the epic vastness of the latter; nevertheless, they both depend upon analysis and experience. I could cite many writers of our own time who, though endowed with temperaments entirely different, meet and unite in the naturalistic formula." Here is a definition which, for all practical purposes, is sufficiently clear. The naturalistic method is scientific, and the naturalistic writer is, in fact, a man of science. His artistic personality asserts itself in his style. In his facts and his conclusions he is, or professes to be, as rigid as a writer on physiology or chemistry.

It is difficult to put the naturalistic formula into practice; and even M. Zola himself has failed to produce novels which can be correctly described as "scientific works." The very framework of a novel involves a certain amount of illusion. The names, at least, must be fictitious; otherwise the novelist will run the risk of having innumerable actions for libel brought against him. Moreover, the novel must have some kind of narrative form, and unless the writer constructs his story out of the materials supplied by the newspapers, or, perhaps, by his own daily experience, how can he avoid introducing fictitious elements?

Take, for instance, a book like *L'Assommoir*. How much of it is literally, or even substantially, true? Are there not passages in it which are either fanciful or exaggerated? It might be urged that the sad history of Gervaise is a transcript from life, but is it possible to transcribe scenes from actual life without, to some extent, changing their aspect? In fact, the temperament of the writer always intervenes to prevent him from copying nature faithfully and dispassionately.

M. Zola acknowledges this with his usual candour. "Without doubt," he says, "we always mix up our own humanity with nature. Still, there is always an abyss between the naturalistic writer who goes from the known to the unknown, and the idealistic writer who pretends to go from the unknown to the known."

It appears, then, that Naturalism is nothing more than an attempt to achieve scientific accuracy as far as possible in literature. M. Zola's error is mainly due to the assumption that there is no essential difference between the work of the physiologist and the work of the novelist. He forgets that it is absolutely necessary for novelists to produce books which possess artistic symmetry, just as it is for a dramatist to invent interesting situations; whereas a physiologist need only discover facts bearing on his particular branch of science, without giving himself much trouble about the question of form. When he takes Claude Bernard's *Introduction à l'Étude de la Médecine Expérimentale* as his text-book, he acts just like a sculptor who takes

some standard work on anatomy as the basis of his art. It is true that M. Zola has the courage of his convictions. He does not shrink from approaching the most painful, the most disgusting aspects of human nature; and the result is that he has been unjustly attacked by sentimental and ridiculously prudish critics.

If M. Zola is right, he cannot be blamed for dealing with even the most brutal side of life. Nobody would dream of accusing a writer on obstetrics of impurity merely because he went into minute details on that subject. But is M. Zola right? Is there any real analogy between the novelist and the physiologist?

Surely a novel, by its very form, is precluded from being classified with purely scientific works. It is, of course, quite possible to embody great ideas in a work of fiction; and this has been done with splendid success by George Eliot in some of her later novels. It is also within the scope of a novel to present exceedingly accurate pictures of real life; and who can deny that we have a proof of this in the works of Fielding—in many respects, perhaps, the greatest of all our English novelists? But imagine a treatise on psychology being bound in a yellow cover, called by some fanciful name, and palmed off on the public as a work of fiction! The thing is too absurd.

M. Zola, in one passage in his book, *Le Roman Expérimental*, says that he objects to the word "Roman," and would like to substitute some expression that would give to the novel a distinctively scientific character. It is evident that he is conscious of the difficulty in which his singular theory—or "formula"—has landed him. He is like a man who wishes to assume two distinct and contradictory parts. He suggests that it would be a happy task for some ingenious inventor of words to rechristen the novel. The French language has, up to the present, failed to supply a term suitable to the requirements of the case. Some writers have pompously described their books as "*études*," but this was too vague a word to convey any definite meaning; and the discarded word "Roman" again crept into use. M. Zola consoles himself by saying:

"For my part, the word would not offend me if it were admitted that the thing had been completely changed. We could find a hundred examples in the language of terms which formerly expressed ideas radically different from those which they express to-day. Our romance of chivalry, our romance of adventures, our romance of the ideal school, have given place to a true criticism of manners and passions, to a study of man under the influence of his temperament and his surroundings."

The truth is that M. Zola has undertaken an impossible task. If the novelist is determined to become a *savant*, let him cease altogether to write novels. You cannot write a story which shall at the same time be a scientific treatise. The two things are incon-

sistent. The scientific writer pays very little attention to form, and, moreover, he must deal with abstract questions. The novelist cannot ignore form—it is of the essence of his work—and he must deal with human nature in the concrete. It is an utter fallacy for M. Zola to lay down that Balzac and Stendhal used the novel as a channel for investigation, just as the *savants* use Science. If *Le Père Goriot* were not a deeply interesting story, very few readers would take the trouble of perusing it from cover to cover. But, indeed, there are passages in that wonderful book which are so strikingly dramatic that Balzac has been accused of introducing them merely for effect, without any regard for truth. Stendhal is realistic; but he is not a writer whose works entitle him to a very high place in French literature. Even Gustave Flaubert has been compelled to yield to the exigencies of fiction, stern and pitiless as he is in his analysis of the passions. *Madame Bovary* is not only cast in the form of a narrative, but its author takes the utmost pains to make the narrative interesting. In fact, Flaubert was one of the greatest of literary artists, and he never assumed the rôle of a man of science. The same observation applies to Edmond and Jules de Goncourt. Their works are only novels dealing with ordinary life in a minutely realistic style. In *Germinie Lacerteux* we have a vivid picture of a servant-girl's misfortunes. The book is characterized by a delightful simplicity. Not for one moment does it suggest the idea of scientific treatment. M. Zola may call it "a complete lesson in moral and physical anatomy;" but the reader who imagines that these words are a true description of *Germinie Lacerteux* will find himself disillusioned on reading the novel.

The real and only merit of the naturalistic school of novelists is not that they have made fiction a branch of science, but that they have given virility to the novel by making it a study of real life. The most brilliant romance is defective if it gives us a distorted view of human nature. For this reason the works of Victor Hugo lack one important element, which might have gained for them immortality.

On the other hand, M. Zola's own works have been greatly impaired by the mass of dry details with reference to genealogy and hereditary characteristics with which they are filled. The series of books which he has produced with a view to tracing out the entire history of a single family—"Les Rougon-Macquart"—cannot be regarded as literary works of the highest order. Compared with such novels as *Madame Bovary* or *Germinie Lacerteux*, they appear dull, laboured, and uninteresting. Some of them contain passages of extraordinary power, such as the description of the starvation and death of Gervaise, in *L'Assommoir*, and the closing scenes in *Germinal*. But as works of fiction they are artistically defective, and will not stand the test of criticism.

Other novelists who have exhibited great genius, such as Alphonse Daudet, have studied life closely, and reproduced it with daring minuteness of detail. Others, whose principal faculty is keen observation, have filled their books with repulsive and unclean pictures. Amongst the latter class of writers we may include M. J. K. Huysmans and M. Guy de Maupassant. They differ, however from M. Zola in their adherence to narrative form; and thus they are, in the true sense of the word, novelists.

Amongst living English writers of fiction there is one who has, to some extent, abandoned the characteristic form of the novel. I allude to Mr. George Meredith. But he is certainly not a naturalist. He is simply a literary eccentric who writes clever books and mis-calls them novels.

With M. Zola the case is different. He has made Naturalism his creed. As Mr. Henry James puts it, "he has a system, a passionate conviction, a great plan;" but this system is unworkable—it is based on a radical error. Carried away by his enthusiastic admiration for the scientific method, he has vainly attempted to change the essential character of the novel. He has made the grand mistake of confusing the functions of science and art; and in spite of his genius, his works will be principally interesting to the literary historian of the future as the results of an unsuccessful experiment.

INDEPENDENT SECTION.

[Under the above title a limited portion of THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW is occasionally set apart for the reception of able Articles, which, though harmonizing with the general spirit and aims of the Review, may contain opinions at variance with the particular ideas or measures it advocates. The object of the Editors in introducing this department is to facilitate the expression of opinion by writers of high mental power and culture, who, while they are zealous friends of freedom and progress, yet differ widely, on special points of great practical concern, both from the Editors and from each other.]

THE DAWN OF CREATION

OR, THE GENESIS OF THE ELEMENTS.¹

IN all ages, from the time of the old Greek and Egyptian philosophers downwards, speculation has been rife as to the origin and constitution of Matter. At the beginning of the present century, which witnessed the first dawn of the science of chemistry, the vague speculations of former times were again revived, but this time in a more consistent shape.

About 1804 Dalton first formulated his great law, known as the Atomic Theory—which forms the basis of all chemistry—that *no substance ever combines with any other, except in fixed and invariable proportions, or in simple multiples of those proportions, this proportion differing for different substances, but being always a fixed quantity or its multiple for each.* Shortly after this the hypothesis was advanced by Prout (a distinguished chemist of that day), that all the so-called elements were derived from hydrogen, the lightest one, and also the one possessing the smallest atomic weight. On the basis of this hypothesis, he concluded that the atomic weights of all the elements would be ultimately found to be simple multiples of the atomic weight of hydrogen, or that, in other words, taking hydrogen as unity, the atomic weights of all the others would be found to be represented by whole numbers. This hypothesis found at the time a considerable number of adherents, and elicited much discussion. Not a very long time elapsed, however, before it had to be abandoned.

¹ *Cosmic Evolution.* By E. A. Ridsdale, Associate of the Royal School of Mines. London: H. K. Lewis. *Stellar Evolution, and its Relation to Geological Time.* By James Croll, LL.D., F.R.S. London: Stanford & Co.

This was chiefly due to the investigations of Dumas, the celebrated French chemist, and a few others, and the hypothesis was finally demolished by the classical researches of Stas, which form a perfect model of exactitude, even at the present moment. The idea that the elements were primarily derived from one, or a small number, of original forms of Matter, did not, however, on this account disappear entirely, for it was revived in a modified form by even Dumas himself, who imagined that probably the atomic weights of all the elements would be found to be multiples of half the atomic weight of hydrogen. A nearer approach to the truth seemed, at first, to be attained on this basis, but on rigorous investigation this theory also had to be given up as presenting too many exceptions.

Matter is known to us in three different states—solid, liquid, and gaseous. The first two of these forms had of course been recognized from the earliest times, but it is only so recently as within the last hundred or hundred and forty years that it has come to be admitted that all matter is capable of assuming the gaseous form if the temperature to which it is exposed be sufficiently increased, and the pressure to which it is submitted be at the same time sufficiently diminished, or that all gases, on the other hand, may be liquefied by sufficient cold with pressure. Indeed, all the gases once supposed to be permanent have now been liquefied by these means, and the liquids so formed would presumably become solidified by a further application of the requisite amount of cold. According to the most modern theory of the constitution of matter first put forward by Daniel Bernouilli, called the Kinetic theory, and since studied and developed by Herepath, Kronig, Joule, Clausius, Clerk Maxwell, Sir Wm. Thompson, and others, the material particles of matter are themselves endowed with a rapid rectilinear motion communicated to them by heat, which in gases, if they are free to expand, is only limited in its course by the amount of heat by which they are actuated. As the general reader may not be acquainted with this theory, I will just try to sketch in a simple manner a few of the conclusions derived from it, which will serve to elucidate it sufficiently for our present purpose. I am indebted to Wurtz for the figures here given, and for some of the deductions derived from them. Atoms are not points in the true mathematical sense of the term. They possess sensible dimensions, and each different kind probably its own determinate form. They may differ, however, from one another in weight. Ether is not an actual void. It is rather a sublimely attenuated gas, forming a homogeneous and continuous medium, extending to all parts of the universe, and transmitting to us with prodigious celerity the vibratory radiations of heat and light which it receives from the sun and the fixed stars. Molecules are conglomerations of atoms combined in very simple proportions, and are endowed with similar vibrations. Atoms appear always to have a tendency to unite with other atoms. At ordinary temperatures,

indeed, atoms would appear to be unable to exist in a free state. Even in an elementary gas, in which there are only atoms of the same kind, we have reason to suppose that the atoms rather unite with one another than remain separate, and that consequently we only probably really have to do with molecules under ordinary circumstances, but at very high temperatures the vibrations of the atoms composing molecules might, it is admitted, attain such activity that the molecules would become separated, and the gas would be dissociated, as it is called, or split up into its components. Diminished pressure would of course favour the change. If we could imprison a small sample of a gas, say, hydrogen, for instance, in a glass vessel at the normal temperature and pressure, and apply to it a microscope of such power as would render the molecules visible, it may be presumed that we should see the whole interior of the vessel alive with vibrating molecules, striking now against each other, now against the sides of the vessel. Consequently they would not be free to move as if the gas were in a more attenuated condition. Also, the molecules of the air outside the vessel breaking upon its sides with the same degree of force as those of the hydrogen within, equilibrium would exist, but if more hydrogen were forced into the vessel, or if the velocity of the vibrations of the hydrogen within it were augmented by heating, pressure would immediately be felt on its interior, as the sides of the vessel would receive more impacts from within in the same space of time than the exterior. Of course all this is, and probably always will remain, a matter of speculation, as it deals with the invisible, but it is the only theory yet put forward which explains certain facts which we know regarding the molecular structure of bodies, and accounts in a rational way for many of their properties, which fits in with the atomic theory of Dalton and the law of volumes of Gay-Lussac, with the teaching of Avogadro and Ampère, and which besides, when used as a basis of calculation by different mathematicians starting from different data, leads to results which are approximately similar. We may therefore accept it as being at least a probable approach to the truth. The presumed motions of the unseen world of atoms and molecules are only a rational extension of a general law under which energy seems to pervade the whole of nature. As Mendeleef has shown, from the movements of suns and their surrounding planets in space, down to the vibrations of the minutest atoms from agglomerations of which the largest masses are built up, all is motion, and there would seem to be no actual stillness in nature. If a solid body be heated, part of the heat which enters it is used up in raising its temperature, but another and a variable portion, according to the substance acted on, is employed in the mechanical work of increasing the vibrations of its molecules, and so driving them further apart. In other words, the body expands when heated, but, as the molecules become thus separated, their mutual attraction diminishes, and

cohesion becomes enfeebled, till at last the molecules become reduced to that state where they move and slip easily over one another, and the solid melts into a liquid. On a greater application of heat the molecular velocities becoming increased and the area of their movements extended, the molecules thus become still further separated, and a time arrives when, this separation overcoming altogether their mutual attraction, the liquid volatilizes, suddenly expanding itself into a gas. The molecules themselves are considered to occupy but a very small space as compared with that covered by their trajectory; thus Clausius calculates that, at the average temperature and pressure in a cubic centimetre of air, the material molecules would occupy a space equal to but one-third of a square millimetre—i.e., about one three-thousandth part of the whole. According also to the calculations of the same savant the molecules of air vibrate when under the standard or average temperature and pressure with a mean velocity of 485 metres per second, and the molecules of hydrogen with a mean velocity of 1844 metres per second. Some idea of the rapidity and force of these vibrations may be formed from the fact that a cannon ball, if projected vertically at a rate of only 485 metres per second, would attain an elevation of 1200 metres before beginning to descend. Such a speed seems almost incredible. However, as has been explained, even gaseous molecules are generally so hampered in their vibrations as to be far from being able to move freely; indeed, when sufficiently compressed and cooled, they approach so closely to one another that they begin to exert a mutual attraction and show a sensible tendency to liquefaction. This accounts for the fact that gases, when near the point of their condensation to the liquid state, present notable deviations from what is known as the law of Boyle—viz., *that the volume of a gas is always inversely as the pressure to which it is subjected, so long as the temperature remains constant.* This deviation from a general law has furnished the basis on which were founded the calculations already given, as well as for several others; for instance, the approximate determination of the space passed through by a molecule of air at 0° of centigrade and at standard pressure. This distance has been estimated to be but ninety-five millionths of a millimetre. Such a magnitude as this is about twenty-five times less than the smallest object visible to our most powerful microscopes, and the number of impacts received by such a molecule is calculated to be four thousand seven hundred millions per second, supposing it to move at a rate of only 477 metres per second. But Clausius has gone even further than this; he has actually tried, and to all appearances with an approach to success, to gauge the actual average size of the molecules of air. These he estimates as, on the average, of about the volume of cubes, the side of which would be the millionth of a millimetre, but he, of course, could not go so far as to venture

any opinion as to their real form. It has likewise been found possible to calculate approximately the average number of molecules which should exist in a given volume of air at standard temperature and pressure; and it has been estimated that, under these conditions, a cubic centimetre, = 0.061 cubic inch, of air would contain no less than twenty-one trillions of molecules, or twenty-one followed by eighteen cyphers. Such numbers almost defy conception, but still they must be very near the truth; for, as has been previously stated, much the same conclusions have been arrived at by different persons starting from quite other premises.

As time progressed the number of bodies which resisted all attempts at decomposition by every known agent became seriously augmented, and even during the last few years the list of elements, or simple substances, has been raised from 65 or 66 to 69 or 70. Many of the facts of chemistry, however, seem most decidedly to point to the probability of all the so-called elements having their origin in but one or two simple substances, or, any way, in a very limited number. It seems so much more rational, if only it can be proved to be fairly probable, that matter should not be composed of such a great variety of elementary bodies, each one of which would involve a separate act of creation. The similarity of the manner in which all the elements are affected by such exterior agents as heat and electricity is remarkable, as they often merely seem to differ among themselves in the degree to which they are so influenced. The way, for instance, in which certain compounds may be proved to become dissociated by heat—sal ammoniac, for example—would lead one to surmise that, by means of some still more powerful agent than any we now have at our command, not only might compounds of molecules with other molecules be split up into their components, but the molecules themselves might be dissociated into their constituent atoms, and in many of those substances which we are accustomed to designate as elements might be resolved and proved to be nothing but compounds in reality. Many so-called elements, while not really changing in composition; will, under certain circumstances, become totally altered in their appearance and in many of their properties, so much so that one might almost take them to be new elements, thus proving that, merely by some re-arrangement interiorly of their particles which we have been unable to follow, they have become so completely transformed in their nature that only one step more, as it were, seems necessary to complete their conversion into other bodies. Sulphur and phosphorus form familiar examples of such a change. Look at carbon in the three forms under which we know it. While charcoal or coke is producible at an ordinary red heat, graphite or plumbago requires a far higher temperature, one even approaching that of the blast furnace being necessary for its formation, and even then its constitution seems scarcely to be so perfect as that we find

in nature; and the diamond, with its sparkling brilliancy, its refractile power, its hardness, and its rarity, all our efforts have hitherto failed to produce even the feeblest imitation of,—probably from lack of some agent of sufficient power—and yet it is well known that all three are but different forms of carbon. If carbon, then, can assume such varying forms, surely there is nothing inconceivable in the idea that, by some new and hitherto unattainable power, any of the substances now accepted as elements should be able to be either dissociated into two or more substances or transmuted into other elements. We are evidently fast returning to the days of alchemy. It is also a striking fact how a mere increase in the quantity of combined oxygen serves so to alter the properties of the two oxides of iron as to render them as dissimilar as if they were oxides of two different metals, and the same change holds good in their compounds. Many instances of the same kind might be cited. Again, we can hardly fail to observe how in organic chemistry, which seems to be almost a kind of shadow of the inorganic, substances occur which, though indisputably compounds, yet act as if they were elementary bodies. Thus we have cyanogen and the cyanides corresponding to chlorine and the chlorides, organic oxides acting like metallic oxides, and other organic compounds acting like the metals themselves.

These and many other considerations render it far from improbable that those substances which we are accustomed to regard as elements would all of them prove to be compounds and often built up from one another, did we only possess agents powerful enough for their decomposition. Mr. Ridsdale, in his clever little work entitled *Cosmic Evolution*, does not treat of the original production of matter, which he evidently supposes to have already existed, but rather of the evolution of those substances which to us are elementary, and this he does by a very remarkable extension of the theory of Prout, in which, while accounting for our inability to decompose those substances which we accept as elements, he admits the probability that they may all really have been derived from one or two substances, composing an ultra gaseous ethereal medium heated to an enormous temperature, and so that there is nothing inconsistent in their being elementary to their present environment, though really they may be compounds, and that most of them may still be none the less elements to us. He calls them indeed “sub-elements.” He shows us the connection between organic and inorganic evolution. As he says, the former may be looked upon as being, “as it were, a new graft on the dying trunk of an older growth,” inorganic evolution. Each change, says he, “is an effort of nature to adapt herself to the new conditions imposed upon her which are continually being produced,” for change begets change. “In organic life a change of environment, such as completely alters the conditions of existence, results in the death of the subject; in the inorganic world it results

in chemical change." He remarks that among living things there is a continual tendency to the disappearance of the lower organisms, and the increase of the more perfect forms, but that after death all this is changed, the law of "the survival of the most inert"—the tendency to dynamic equilibrium of Mendeleef—resumes its sway over the dead matter, and those materials which were formed under the influence of life are split up into others more able to support the new environment to which they are subjected. It is a curious consideration, and a remarkable instance of the universality of the law of the conservation of energy, that, whereas all animal life is either directly or indirectly nourished by vegetation, the latter in its turn may be said to derive its chief, if not its entire, nutriment from the carbonic dioxide and watery vapour of the atmosphere. From a material point of view, death, then, may be said simply to result in a redistribution among the molecules forming the body of the vital force which held them together during life. For, as the body perishes, its constituents become dissipated in the gaseous form, and they thus resume the activity and comparative freedom of which they had been temporarily robbed while imprisoned in the living body. Without defining any particular conditions of density or atomic weight for the primary substance or substances from which our elements have been derived, he begins with the supposition that the materials composing our globe, which has evidently once solidified from a molten state, were at one time heated to stellar temperature—that is to say, probably to a temperature far surpassing that of the electric arc, or, indeed, any temperature of which we can form a conception. At such a temperature as this he presumes that every body would be converted into a gas, and that all our elements would be volatilized, and many of them, probably all, completely dissociated, if they were compound. Evidences of the great chemical activity which must, formerly, have prevailed among the materials composing our earth are still to be found, though they can give but a very faint notion of what can have been the condition of things in former ages, in the oxidized crust of the globe in its globular form, evidently proving it once to have been in a molten state, and in the incessant chemical changes still therein taking place. There must still, as it would appear, be a continuous turmoil going on in the sun, the centre of our planetary system, if we may judge from the formation of the solar spots and the appearances they present when optically examined. Spectral analysis, by which we are able to recognize the existence of many of our terrestrial elements in the sun's atmosphere, shows us that when a maximum of solar activity is reached some of these elements disappear altogether, to reappear again when that activity moderates. Iron is remarkable among these, and, indeed, the sun must probably just now be in that condition "where this element is being evolved." To judge from

appearances the temperature of our sun must be on the wane, that of some of the fixed stars, if we may judge from their colour, being far hotter.

Mr. Ridsdale supposes the nebula from which our planetary system was condensed to have been slowly cooled. Under these circumstances two or more substances might at first be formed, perhaps from one unique original, and these, combining among themselves, might produce others. The materials might still continue to be gaseous, though not so simple as at first, and they might still be heated beyond all our powers of conception, but the complete dis-ociation which existed at first would no longer be there. Finally, by successive stages, all the present list of elements might be produced, and although these might be able to resist any temperature which we could bring to bear on them, they would, nevertheless, be compound bodies in reality. Of course, under these circumstances, those compounds possessing the strongest affinities at that particular temperature would be the first to rush together, then those with less affinities, and so on, till finally we might expect that some small residues would be left of such extremely weak affinities that mere fractional precipitation would suffice to separate them, or in which the bodies produced would be of such similarity, and so little differing in general properties, that the only way of separating them would be by taking advantage of the slight difference which existed between their respective affinities for acids, as has lately been so beautifully exemplified by Crookes in his decomposition of the rare earth Yttria. If this theory, then, be true, the word element becomes only a relative term. Of course, such a theory as this will meet with obstinate opposition in some quarters. It will be objected that it is, and always must remain, purely speculative, that it is unsatisfactory, as giving no consideration with respect to the real origin of matter, but that it is merely a plausible account of the manner in which matter has assumed its present form; and, lastly, it will be objected that up to the present time no one has ever succeeded in decomposing any one well-recognized element. It should, however, be remembered that not so very long ago substances were admitted to be elements which have since been proved to be compounds. Potash and soda were so considered till Davy proved their complex nature by subjecting them to the action of the newly discovered agent, the electric current, and showed them to be metallic oxides. Only quite lately, nickel, which has always since its discovery been admitted to be an element, has been stated to have been proved to be a compound. If chemists, then, have been mistaken before, as they often have, surely time may be expected to show us other instances of the same kind. One thing is rather confirmatory of Mr. Ridsdale's theory, and that is, the frequent occurrence together of substances possessing similarity in their

general properties ; thus, we have Yttria, Erbium, Ytterbia, the metals of the platinum group, those of the nickel group, &c., each of them frequently associated in nature. As the author very justly concludes, in such a whirlwind of giant forces, acting on so prodigious a scale, we should have fresh combinations, decompositions, and recombinations continually going on : those compounds possessing strong affinities would be the first to combine, and of these and their subsequent intercombinations "the most inert as a whole alone would persist." At first we might expect that the bodies formed would be both abundant and simply constituted, and that as time progressed rarer and more complex ones would be formed. This complexity would necessarily involve an increase in the atomic weights, and this is just what is the case in nature. The rarer elements generally possess the highest atomic weights. We should here, indeed, have a laboratory in which would be worked out some of the most intricate problems of thermo-chemistry on the most enormous scale, and that at temperatures completely unattainable by our limited means. As he says, the doctrine of "the survival of the most inert," here exemplified, may, upon the basis of such a hypothesis—for hypothesis it must always remain, however probable it may appear until proved true—will, as applied to the evolution of inorganic matter as we know it, take the place of the doctrine of "the survival of the fittest," as applied by Darwin to the evolution and differentiation of organic species. "As," he says, "the simple protoplasmic cell has become developed into the highly organized vertebrate, so the simple primordial atom has become diversified and developed into the highly complex molecules of the bodies now existent on earth." It might be expected, he says, that as the earth cooled down and the bodies formed became more and more inert under the existing conditions, and as the activity of the sub-element-forming materials became more and more neutralized, the earth would become more quiescent, and we have every reason to believe that this has really been the case, but at the same time many bodies which were inert to the environment which at one time existed might be broken up by that which existed later on. "The loss of heat," he says, "would alone be sufficient to account for the chaining up of this vast activity," but such a law must have demanded an enormous lapse of time for its execution.

The question here presents itself, what can become of the vast amount of heat and light radiated from the sun and the fixed stars, and apparently passing into empty space and being lost, which can hardly be the case. Various theories have been proposed to show how such a loss may not take place. But if, as some people suppose, the visible sidereal system, vast as it is, only forms but a mere fraction of the universe, which is unlimited in extent, there would be yet another explanation to be given. The number of stars would

then also be unlimited, and the radiations of heat and light emanating from them would be bound at length to meet, with some material object by which they would be absorbed, and so, although they might take any length of time in reaching their destination, energy would not be lost. Another proof of the probable derivation in this manner of matter, as we know it, from some other and simpler form lies in the remarkable tendency which seems to exist in the spectra of most bodies to become more simplified under the action of heat. When the temperature of their vapour is very greatly augmented, a band, which, at a lower temperature, was either feeble or entirely absent, often makes its appearance, and so grows in intensity as frequently to eclipse those which, at a lower temperature, characterized the substance.

Electricity is still, we may say, in its infancy, and we can hardly suppose that we yet know all its properties and capabilities. Perhaps it, or some still more powerful agent yet undiscovered, may some day allow us to test the truth of Mr. Ridsdale's theory. Till then we can only treat it as a most interesting and plausible hypothesis, but it certainly may be looked upon as the best and most probable explanation that has yet appeared of a most vexed question. The little book contains nothing beyond the grasp of an ordinary intellect, and altogether it deserves more than a mere cursory glance.

So much space has been devoted to the consideration of *Cosmic Evolution*, that but little room remains for the consideration of *Stellar Evolution*, so that I fear I shall hardly be able to treat it as it deserves.

The object of this book is to prove the probability of the impact theory—viz., that stars, *i.e.*, suns, and the planetary systems by which they are all probably surrounded, were most likely produced from the collisions of dark, cold, solid, masses, moving with great velocity in space, the result of such suddenly arrested momentum being a vast development of heat, far greater, probably, than anything which our limited means will allow us even to approach, and by dint of which all solid materials would be volatilized into a highly tenuous gas and possibly dissociated, no compound body being able to exist at such a temperature.

I do not agree with the impact theory myself, for reasons given further on. The book, however, contains much matter of independent interest which renders it well worthy of consideration. Our author, at once entering upon his subject, speculates as to the probable origin of meteorites, which he compares in point of composition with what would probably be that of the interior of our earth, and from this he argues that they are most probably bits detached from the masses during the collisions which he presumes to have taken place. He shows that there must have been a

considerable number of these collisions when he says that Professor Newcomb estimates the universe "to contain 100,000,000 stars or suns," belonging, all except one, to other systems than our own, "averaging five times the mass of our sun, and placed at such a distance from us that their light," although travelling at a speed of about ten millions of geographical miles per minute, "must take on the average no less than some thirty thousand years to reach us." It takes about ten years for light to reach us from one of the nearest—if not the nearest—of the fixed stars, 61 Cygni, as calculated from observations made on the eclipses of Jupiter's moons, by which the velocity of light has been estimated. To show the wonderful velocity with which the movements of some of the heavenly bodies are endowed, he refers to one of them—viz., the star 1830 Groombridge—which, he says, has been estimated to be moving through space at no less than "200 miles per second." Many others also travel with great speed. He concludes that if the dark stellar masses collided at anything like such a speed as this, not only would they be broken to pieces, but that so much heat would be generated as would convert even their most refractory constituents into gas at an enormous and otherwise unattainable temperature. Nebulæ, he concludes, are composed of such a gas, and the great space they occupy is accounted for by the degree to which it is attenuated by heat, aided by diminished pressure. The light of most of the nebulæ appears to be mainly derived, he says, from glowing hydrogen and nitrogen of extreme tenuity, and he supposes that their temperature must be such that the genesis of the other elements would not yet have begun. The light emitted would probably be no measure of this temperature; observe, for instance, he says, the flame of the oxy-hydrogen blow-pipe, which is scarcely visible by daylight, in spite of the high temperature it possesses.

That our planetary system is probably derived from a nebula may be also inferred, he affirms, by comparing the specific gravities of the planets composing it, which would naturally become greater as the materials of which they were composed became more complex, and as the bodies formed became of a higher atomic weight. Thus, the density of the planet Neptune, which is the furthest from the sun, being compared with that of Mercury, which is the nearest, is as 1 to 5. The author of *Cosmic Evolution* also remarks on this fact, but he does not attach any great importance to it. He then goes into some curious figures as to the age of the sun's heat, and concerning the lapse of geological time as deduced, first from the amount of materials carried down into the sea by rivers, and next by estimating the extent to which the rivers have worn away the rocks over which they have passed, for rivers would only result from water, evaporated from the ocean by the heat of the sun, falling again as rain. He also alludes to the respective esti-

mates of Professors Houghton and Wallace on this point. "Ramsay," he says, "estimates 9000 feet of the carboniferous formation to have been removed from the Mendips during geological time, and, according to Geikie, over a mile thick of the same formation has been denuded from the Pentlands." He also gives some interesting calculations as to geological time deduced by Rogers, Lesley, Winchell, and others, from the measurement of geological faults in various parts of the world. Altogether, seeing that the rocks now existing were formed by the débris of still older ones, he estimates that a total of 90,000,000 years must be the least amount of time that can possibly have elapsed since life first appeared on the earth.

In regard to his views respecting the evolution of the elements, he appears to agree with many of those held by the author of *Cosmic Evolution*. Professor F. W. Clarke, he says, states that "the demonstrated unity of force leads us to expect by analogy a similar unity in matter." Clarke also says: "It is difficult to understand how our sun and the stars could have been evolved from nebulae without assuming an evolution of the chemical elements. The true nebulae show the presence of only two elements, nitrogen and hydrogen, but our sun contains more than a dozen distinct ones, and the planets more than three times that number. How, then, could all these have arisen out of nebulae, composed of simply nitrogen and hydrogen?" Truly, evolution is the only explanation. When he speaks of the planets he must have meant to speak of the earth, as he could not tell what the others contained; if so, he might indeed have said nearly six rather than three times, without, in this case, involving any error.

The stars have been classed into four groups, according to the appearance of the light they emit as examined simply by the telescope, as well as by the spectroscope, which groups, as Professor Clarke has remarked, probably indicate various stages of evolution. The first, the white stars, like Sirius, says Clarke, are the hottest, and show a predominance of hydrogen. In the second class, the metallic elements become more numerous; while in the third class the hydrogen is difficult to detect. Passing backwards, we have the cosmical dust or fire mist of the nebulae, and, receding still further, we have the universal atmosphere from which the fire mist is assumed to have been derived. The dissociation of the elements as applied to stellar physics was first put forward by Sir Benjamin Brodie in 1866 and 1867, and shortly afterwards by Sterry Hunt and by Lockyer. The same view of the unity of matter was also held by Graham, Dumas, Henri Sainte, Claire Deville, Berthelot, and many others, with various modifications. Crookes, speaking of the bearing of Newland's periodic law on the doctrine of the unity of matter, calls the supposed primordial substance protyle. "This protyle," he infers, "would be a store of chemical and Kinetic

energy, and from it might be derived all the elements by combinations and recombinations."

In favour of the impact theory, our author argues, as I have already stated, that meteorites are evidently portions of the dark stellar masses which have been projected into space beyond the sphere of attraction by the force of the collision. All these conditions he here considers more categorically than the space at my disposal will allow me to follow. It can hardly be admitted as probable that the evolution of the elements can have actually commenced in these supposed dark cold bodies. It must, as far I can see, have owed its existence to an act of creation. Matter cannot have existed eternally, and it seems just as reasonable to suppose that it should have been created at once in the hot pre-nebulous state as in the cold solid form. In this connection our author again quotes Mr. Crookes: "In the primal stage of the universe, before matter, as we now find it, was formed from protyle, all was in an ultra-gaseous state at a temperature inconceivably hotter than anything now existing in the visible universe, so high indeed that the chemical atoms could not probably have been formed." Our author remarks that the impact theory can alone account for this high temperature, for it would have generated "a temperature of no less than about 300,000,000° Cent." = 605,000,000° Fahr. I suppose these figures are the result of calculation. The probability is that everything—the elements if they existed—would by such a temperature not only have become gaseous, but would have been converted back into the original protyle from which they were derived, to be again reconverted into their atomic condition as the temperature slowly fell. He also further quotes Professor Winchell, who says: "We have not the slightest scientific grounds for assuming that matter existed from all eternity, and only began undergoing its changes a few millions or billions of years ago. The essential activity of the powers ascribed to it forbids the thought. For all that we know—and indeed as the *conclusion* from all that we know—primal matter began its progressive changes on the morning of its existence. As, therefore, the series of changes is demonstrably finite, the lifetime of matter is necessarily finite." However far, indeed, we trace back its commencement, matter must have had a beginning. These, says our author, are the consequences which follow from every theory of stellar evolution which has hitherto been advanced. He says that the impact theory completely removes the difficulty. True, it would, but, as it appears to me, by substituting for it one still greater.

Collision by gravitation he declares to be inadmissible, so let us reject it off hand. If the dark masses possessed a motion of their own, however, they must have been very numerous for so many collisions to have happened. If such masses, large enough to form

stars and the planetary systems by which they are surrounded, are careering about in space at such furious speed, and in number sufficient to produce even occasional collisions, how is it that none of them has ever come so far within reach of our sun as to shine with light borrowed from it as the planets do? Besides, the existence of solid matter presupposes its previous existence in the ultra gaseous or, to say the least, in the gaseous form. Why, then, make it take both the gaseous and the solid form twice over, as we should do by admitting the truth of the impact theory as Mr. Croll has it? How account, on the impact theory, for stars suddenly making their appearance and then as suddenly disappearing? One appeared in the year 125 B.C. in this way, and was seen by Hipparchus among others; it was so bright as to be visible by day, but it disappeared without even leaving a trace. Many others have also appeared and vanished in the same way, some even quite lately. Or how, on this hypothesis, account for variable and periodical stars like Mira Ceti, which appears at fixed intervals of a little over 331 days, and then gradually fades away? Crookes makes no allusion to the impact theory, and Winchell evidently, from the quotation given above, does not believe in matter having at first possessed the solid form, any more than he does in its existence from all eternity. We are thus at length led to admit the creative power by which matter must have had its origin, whether as protyle or not. The segregated or unequal distribution of the visible stars into groups in space shows apparently some preconceived design which also speaks of creation. Everything points to the probable derivation of matter from an original ethereal form in which it was created, and to its subsequent conversion, by slow condensation and inter-combination, into the elements as we now know them. As to the eternity of matter, he concludes as follows: "We have no grounds to conclude that there is anything eternal but God, Time, and Space, but if time and space be subjective, as Kant supposes, and not pertaining to the existence of things in themselves, then God alone was uncreated, and of Him and to Him are all things."

This is a sketch of the matter contained in these two books; both are highly interesting, and they are not burdened with chemical formulæ, mathematical calculations, or abstruse phraseology of any kind, but are thoroughly readable by the ordinary public, and they are both of them likely to become standard works in the libraries, both of the scientific inquirer and the general reader.

FARNHAM MAXWELL LYTE.

TZAR-TYRANT OR TZAR-TRIBUNE?

IN discussing English politics in the columns of the newspaper which it is his present fortune to direct, Mr. W. T. Stead is a pronounced and uncompromising Radical. In theory, at least, he would look after every one's wrongs and wipe away all tears. Writing not long ago in one of the Reviews touching the journalist's work, he said: "Into his ears are poured the cries, the protests, the complaints of men who suffer wrong, and it is his mission to present them daily before the conscience of mankind. . . . There is something inexpressibly pathetic in the dumbness of the masses of the people. Touch but a hair in the head of the well-to-do, and forthwith you hear his indignant protest in the columns of the *Times*. But the million who have to suffer the rudest buffets of ill-fortune, the victims of official insolence and the brutality of the better off, they are as dumb as the horse which you may scourge to death without its uttering a sound. . . . To give utterance to the inarticulate moan of the voiceless is to let light into a dark place; it is almost equivalent to the enfranchisement of a class. A newspaper in this sense is a daily apostle of fraternity, a messenger who bringeth glad tidings of joy, of a great light that has risen upon those who sit in darkness and the shadow of death."

When it was learned that the author of these words was to visit Russia for the purpose of writing about its foreign and domestic affairs, lovers of democracy whose sympathies are not bounded by State lines awaited the outcome with some interest. There has been much writing of late about the country of the Tzar. Hurried ones have hastened across and around it, and, tarrying for a space in its half-dozen chief cities, have returned with voluminous notes, recklessly gathered, and proceeded to make books. None of them, however, brought back the elusive truth. This pleasing task was reserved for Mr. Stead. Passing over, then, that portion of his work, *Truth about Russia*, in which the foreign policy of the empire is treated of, it is of interest to inquire how the domestic situation impressed the journalistic ambassador. Mr. Stead is never lukewarm. A Radical man-at-arms in England, once the Russian frontier is crossed, he poses as a friend of autocracy. Professing as he does a measureless contempt for the diurnal men of letters who endeavour to report judicially on a given phase of public affairs

(he terms them *eunuchs*), Mr. Stead precipitates himself into the Russian lists with the zeal of a *condottiere*. "The Tzar," he tells us with insistent emphasis, "is the Tribune of his people, and when the Tzar ceases to be Tribune he will cease to be Tzar." This is the key-note of his utterances on Russia.

The Russian Radicals, on the other hand, contend that Alexander the Third is not his people's Tribune; that he never has been, and, if his record and present indications count for anything, that he never will be. They maintain that his Government is one of confusion, wherein subordinates throughout the realm are, in their respective spheres, practically despots; that, in fact, on its bureaucratic side the Government presents the closest possible approach to anarchy.

Decidedly, the divergence between these two points of view is a very wide one. It matters not that Mr. Stead passed only two months in Russia, and does not, by his own admission, know six words of the language; nor that the Radicals, because of the faith that is in them, are frequently forced to sacrifice liberty and fortune and taste the bitterness of prison-pen and exile. This does not prove that they are right and Mr. Stead wrong, nor should it be urged as an argument against the latter that, with the exception of a week's stay at the country-place of Count Tolstoi, his time in Russia would seem to have been passed amid all the "artificialities of high society" at St. Petersburg; or that his pages bristle with the views of the autocracy and Government officials high in favour, while failing utterly to disclose the opinions and aspirations of the Radicals; or that he contemptuously dismisses them and their cause, as he himself says, *sans cérémonie*, because—"except so far as their ideas are shared by their Emperor, they do not count."

Somewhat arbitrary, perhaps, this mode of dealing *en bloc* with the claims of the advocates of constitutional freedom, but Mr. Stead could easily retort, "What business have they, these Radicals, with ideas not shared by their Emperor?"

It was to be expected, perhaps, that Mr. Stead should have made it his first business in Russia to look up the Tzar's private record; the result is thus summarized: he is "a devoted husband, whom not even his worst enemies have ever accused of a single fault against his wife." After this, one need not be told the place that Alexander holds in Mr. Stead's esteem. What matters it that Russian men and women are imprisoned and exiled unheard, that honest inquiry is strangled, that the newspapers such as are still unsuppressed dare not print the truth, that teaching is a crime, that brutal Tchinovniks grind the poor, that soulless governors legalize injustice, that peaceful peasants are shot dead if they approach too near the railway line when the Tzar takes an airing—so long as he commits no fault against his wife? The Radicals might urge that they are not concerned with

the private life of the autocrat, and that his family vices and virtues in no way affect them; and some could even go so far as to assert that for their part they would perhaps prefer a little less private, and a little more public, virtue; but, as Mr. Stead very pertinently points out, "except so far as their ideas are shared by their Emperor, they do not count."

It is worth while to piece together certain phases of things in Russia, not from the testimony of publicists in favour of constitutional freedom, but from Mr. Stead's own pages. If it shall be shown that the Tzar is, as he strenuously insists, the Tribune of his people, one may need to readjust certain old-fashioned notions touching despotism and the abuse of power, and conclude with Mr. Stead that the problem of democracy is after all largely a geographical one, and that while a free press is doubtless a very good thing in England, it would be a very bad thing in Russia. Possibly we may come in time to think that liberty is well enough for the Anglo-Saxon, but not for the peasants of the Volga or the working men of St. Petersburg.

Mr. Stead admits that "the Emperor's letter-bag is almost the only means by which the mass of his subjects can make known to the man who is their natural and appointed Tribune their grievances or their complaints. The department of the Imperial Chancery which attends to this tribunitial side of the Emperor's daily work is presided over by General de Richter. . . . To him the Emperor refers the one hundred and sixty petitions per day which arrive on an average every twenty-four hours."

At this point, burdened by the pains of prose, the historian glides gently into soothing rhyme. "Gen. Richter is the Sandalphon of the Empire. He listens to the sounds that ascend from below :

'From the spirits on earth that adore,
From the souls that entreat and implore,
In the fervour and passion of prayer:
From the hearts that are broken with losses,
And weary with dragging of crosses
Too heavy for mortals to bear.'

He is the doorkeeper of the Earthly Providence whom men call the Tzar. . . . Alexander the Third is the shepherd of his flock. Every member of that flock has a right of direct appeal to him, and woe be to the hireling who ventures to stand between the shepherd and the sheep. . . . Every post-office is open. Every mail-train will bear the petition to the Emperor's council-chamber."

Merely noting in passing that out of the "shepherd's" one hundred and twenty million "sheep" quite one hundred million can neither read nor write, let us see how this charmingly idyllic theory on paper of the Emperor's tribunitial character maps out in practice. It does not of course affect the soundness of Mr. Stead's theory, that

five out of six "sheep" cannot write, for they might delegate the task to those who could.

"The Emperor is head of the executive power and Tribune of the people. These are two functions equally necessary and indispensable. The Government must go on, and there is no power but the Emperor's will to make it march. He is the source of all power. . . . The great machine of Government, the executive in all its branches, has the autocracy as its central principle and initial force. . . . In the case of the Tzar, while there is necessarily constant and close connection between the autocracy and the bureaucracy, there has been a gradual but steady diminution of the points of contact between the autocracy and the democracy. In other words, the Tzar constantly tends to become more and more the first Tchinovnik in the administration. . . . In Russia, the bureaucracy, being constantly *en évidence*, and always able to present sufficient claim for the attention of the Tzar, will inevitably annex the Emperor. . . . For it must never be forgotten that by the law of its being the bureaucracy regards the popular side of the Tzardom as its natural enemy. The natural law of the Tchinovnik is to convert the Tzar into a mere Tchinovnik, and to regard any attempt to exercise the tribunitial power as an attack upon the fundamentals of the State . . . the very conception of the possibility that the Tzar may use his power to punish the Tchinovnik is a nightmare to the official mind. . . . All the doors by which in other States the monarch and his subjects are able to communicate with each other are carefully bolted and barred, and guarded by vigilant sentries of Tchinovniks, who can usually keep the Emperor in a state of ignorance. . . . At present the Tzar has very scanty means of ascertaining the wishes of his subjects or of hearing their complaints; for whenever these wishes and these complaints are opposed to the interests of the officials, they can use his authority to blindfold his eyes and stop his ears. In other words, his subjects cannot speak to the Tzar on those occasions when it is most important . . . that they should speak. . . . Suppose . . . that by some gross job of the Minister of the Interior a corrupt and oppressive governor is appointed to some province. What means are there other than a letter or petition by which the corruption and oppression of that governor can be brought to the knowledge of the Tzar? The prestige of the Tzar's authority is used to blindfold the Tzar. The consequence is, that the most hideous wrongs may be perpetrated, and must, from the nature of things, be sometimes perpetrated. . . . There is little or no check upon misdeeds. The State has repeatedly been plundered in the most scandalous fashion, and no one has dared to expose the theft . . . the Emperor . . . does not know; he cannot know; and so the evil work goes on for years unchecked. The newspapers which are still suffered to exist are all under the thumb of the

Minister of the Interior, who tends more and more to obscure the Tzar from the eyes of his subjects. The things which it is most important a newspaper should say are the things which the Minister of the Interior most resents their saying. . . . By the Russian press-law, any newspaper after a third warning can only be published under the preventive censure, which, in the case of a daily newspaper, is equivalent to suppressing it altogether."

Mr. Stead had an interview with M. Suvorin, the editor of the *Novoe Vremya*, which had already received two warnings, and learned that the first was called out by an article expressing a hope that the new year would bring Russia "peace, prosperity, and a little liberty." The second warning arose from a criticism of a Finance Minister's speech on the ground that he had falsified his figures.

"I pondered over this," writes Mr. Stead, "and then remembering the tribunitial power of the Tzar, and the right which every Russian has to write to him, I asked why M. Suvorin did not write to the Emperor. . . . I was answered, 'He could write to the Emperor, no doubt, but what would be the result? The Emperor would naturally and of necessity lay his complaint before the Minister of the Interior. The more entirely the Emperor took M. Suvorin's side, the more indignant would be the Minister that the matter had been taken over his head to the Emperor. If the Emperor was determined, his immediate petition might be gained, but he would probably be marked down for vengeance at the first opportunity. The Minister would bide his time, but he would take good care that any one (*sic*) suffered for my temerity in appealing to the Emperor against his department.'"

Upon which it is to be presumed that Mr. Stead pondered again. All this, be it observed, in a country where, according to his *Truth*, "the Tzar is the Tribune of his people," and where, "when he ceases to be Tribune he will cease to be Tzar."

Under the head of "A Plea for more Prisons," Mr. Stead points out that "one of the most urgent necessities of Russia is more prisons. . . . There is great overcrowding in most of her gaols. . . . In Russia, if any man is not willing or able to give a correct account of himself and prove his identity . . . he is incontinently clapped into gaol for four years." In the House of Correction, which Mr. Stead visited, he found a man who "had one half the side of his head shaved. He had been in for something . . . and when he came out his papers were missing, and after working for some time on the railway, he was arrested, and was now in for two years." At another gaol he found "a series of large rooms, down the centre of which ran a sloping wooden platform, on which the prisoners slept side by side like sardines . . . without undressing . . . with neither mattress nor blankets. . . . General Gresser, who rules Petersburg with an iron hand, now sends

out of the city twenty thousand persons every year. . . . Any suspected person is liable to be banished the city without notice or trial. . . . Hence many people find themselves in the House of Transfer who have been guilty of no crime. They are simply obnoxious to the heads of the police, or they have lost their papers. . . ."

What does Mr. Stead think of this sort of thing which he saw in all its naked hideousness, and which even to read of is sufficient to stir just men to righteous indignation? Why, forsooth, it merely serves him for the flippant jest, that it "seems rather heavy punishment for attempting to travel *incognito*!"

In the portion of his book entitled "The Shadow on the Throne," Mr. Stead invites the confidence of his reader by stating that the "vehement" Madame Novikoff, having read the proofs, would be "simply horrified to be thought for a moment to be *solidaire*" with his views on religion in Russia. It is not altogether clear why it was necessary for Mr. Stead to thus drag in Madame Novikoff or to enter into any such explanation, but as he has seen fit to do so the fact is worthy of being noted. Mr. Stead does not inform us whether the other portions of the book have received her indulgent approval, but in the absence of any disclaimer, coupled to the fact that he relieves her of all responsibility for the views advanced in "The Shadow on the Throne," it is but fair to assume that she also believes the Tzar to be the Tribune of his people, and shares Mr. Stead's faith in the saving power of the Sandalphon. The defection of the "vehement" one at this point would seem to have been a serious affair with Mr. Stead, for he asserts with a reckless bravado that "in this matter I must speak as I believe." What an amazing confession of joyous irresponsibility elsewhere!

The only present shadow on the Russian throne it seems is the religious persecution which the gentle Tribune of his people has permitted M. Pobedonostzeff to practise. Why should Mr. Stead take up arms for people persecuted on the score of religion while blinking their political persecution? Does not the Tzar-Tribune abet the work, and is he not the loving shepherd of his flock? The Greek Church suffices for the spiritual needs of the Tribune; why is it not good enough for the "sheep?" M. Pashkoff and Count Korff were accused secretly by anonymous witnesses of religious propagandism, and condemned unheard. They were not even permitted to call witnesses in their own defence. The Emperor listened to the report of the prosecutor, and, without even permitting the two accused to appear and answer for themselves, exiled them from Russia. The Tribune of his people did this thing and did it openly and shamelessly, and Mr. Stead denounces—the Tribune? No—the prosecutor; not so much on account of the poor exiles or the principle of the thing, but because he had done even worse than to

introduce personal reprisals into administrative action—"he had made his Emperor unjust!"

But Mr. Stead has formulated a scheme which is to solve all Alexander's troubles, and give him eyes and ears that will see and hear all that passes in his realm. The suggested solvent is a newspaper. In this era of type and printing presses the question of an organ, to Mr. Stead, is merely one of finance; and in order to open up the channel of communication between the Tribune and his "sheep" he sees no way comparable for safety and efficiency to that of the establishment of an Imperial newspaper, in which the "sheep" may set forth their grievances *in extenso*. All thought of the Sandalphon and the poetic tribute to him seems to have faded utterly at this juncture from Mr. Stead's memory. "Such a paper must be the Tribune's paper in the same sense that the army is the Tribune's army and the navy the Tribune's navy. When autocracy survives in an age of democracy and printing presses, it must use the latter to instruct the former if it would continue to exist." What a flood of light is here thrown on the Russian articles which appear from time to time in the columns of the *Pall Mall Gazette*, and what a catholic spirit pervades Mr. Stead's conception of a newspaper! Imagine a Russian journal printing the grievances of the "sheep," and could there be a greater farce than a journal pretending to print them and not doing so? A free press in Russia would accomplish more for constitutional freedom than all the dynamite in existence. The Tzar dare not permit a free press, and as for any other, why waste words about it? The concurrent testimony of all whose opinion is authority is to the effect that the Tzar dreads publicity quite as much as he does dynamite. Every newspaper in Russia which is not printed by stealth is the Tzar's newspaper. Because free speech has been throttled in all the land, Mr. Stead would therefore create a new class of Imperial hangers-on, who would feed fat at the expense of the "sheep," on the pitiful plea that they were running a newspaper in the interest of the fold. Mr. Stead nominates as editor of the proposed Imperial organ General Ignatieff, who will go down to posterity as the most bitter persecutor of the Jews in the nineteenth century, and whose fame as the "Father of Lies" has already circled the globe. Mr. Stead calls him the Russian Gladstone—adding, however, that he is a man of broader view than Mr. Gladstone—and that, believing in the autocracy, he does nothing by halves. At the outset of his many conferences with the General he frankly asked him, with refreshing Northumberland Street delicacy, how he came for so many years to be called the "Father of Lies." General Ignatieff pointed out that it was because he always spoke the truth, and, the matter clinched in so conclusive a fashion, the two became fast friends. Mr. Stead states that when Ignatieff was Minister of the Interior he consti-

tuted a special court where all charges against newspapers were dealt with on an "intelligible" principle. What does Mr. Stead mean by "intelligible," and why does he not give details? Does he not know that Ignatieff is on record as one of the most relentless and wanton persecutors of the press that Russia has had, and that he spent millions of roubles for the promulgation of "safe news;" or does he purposely blink the facts known to every student of Russian affairs?

Here are two pictures which may serve to illustrate the trend of Mr. Stead's sympathies. "The Emperor . . . stands erect and joyous . . . totally free from that worrying fretfulness, that wearing anxiety, which is incompatible with sincere faith in the providence of God. . . . As for . . . the endless coil of Imperial business, it is all in the day's work, which he discharges, so far as he can see it is his to do, with the composure of a philosopher and the serenity of a Christian. . . . He sees what he believes to be his duty from day to day, and he does it honestly to the best of his ability in the spirit of the maxim that 'sufficient to the day is the evil thereof,' and in the faith that strength sufficient for the day will be given him from on high . . . for the Emperor feels that he and his are in the hands of God, who alone sees the end from the beginning, and will find tools to carry on his work when the day comes for that work to be done."

Here is some of the work as chronicled by Mr. Stead. "When last year the Emperor passed southward, the (railway) line was guarded in certain districts by soldiers with loaded rifles. A soldier stood at every fifty yards, with instructions to shoot any one who persisted in approaching the line. Several peasants were shot dead, some because they were too drunk to hear the challenge of the sentry, others because they did not understand it. Navvies working on the line were compelled to withdraw for a quarter of a mile, and for six or eight hours no one was allowed to cross the rails. The inconvenience thereby occasioned can better be imagined than described."

That is all! "The inconvenience thereby occasioned can better be imagined than described." Mr. Stead says nothing further. They were brothers of ours these peasants. One wonders if their families were "inconvenienced." What prattle is this; what revolting cant of the composure of philosophers, the serenity of Christians, duty, faith, providence, and God—the God on whom Mr. Stead blasphemously thrusts the woful burden of these crimes! In what perfect keeping it all is with the words Alexander addressed to the Elders of the Provinces at the time of his coronation. "You have heard," he said, "that there was going to be a new partition of land. It is not true. There will be no addition to your lands. Go home and tell the peasants this. I intend to rule as my father ruled. Learn you to obey as your fathers obeyed."

In a Government by ballot and journalism, in the event of continued misrule, the burden of blame rests with the people. In a Government such as Russia's, where absolute despotism obtains, the blame, if any, lies with the despot. Alexander the Third is as responsible throughout his realm for religious persecution, the oppression of the Jews, the corruption of the bureaucracy, the suppression of the press, and the imprisonment, exile, and death of political opponents without form of law, as was Louis Napoleon responsible in France for the crimes of the Second Empire. That he has, as Mr. Stead is pleased to inform us, "the heart of a little child" and commits no fault against his wife, have as little bearing on the point at issue as the mawkish sentiment of his partisan. Mr. Stead holds the Radicals responsible for the present deplorable aspect of Russian domestic affairs. He maintains that if the men anxious for a more liberal Government were once out of the way, Alexander would become an ideal Tzar-Tribune; that they have promoted injustice and oppression, and interfered to prevent his carrying out the cherished liberal reforms which he has so much at heart! Mr. Stead is not the first romancer to mistake cause for effect. His own admissions establish conclusively that the plea that Alexander is the Tribune of his people is one of the ghastliest fictions ever invented to bolster despotism.

SHERIDAN FORD.

HOME AFFAIRS.

PARLIAMENT is the great place of surprises. A month ago we had fallen upon a time of political dulness which promised to last until an early prorogation. Suddenly we have a revival of commotion, which threatens to colour the rest of the Session and to keep Parliament at Westminster for many more days. An unexpected demand for money for two members of the Royal Family standing in the third generation, is mainly responsible for this change in the situation. We write whilst the matter is in the initial stage—before the Select Committee, to which the Queen's Messages have been referred, has reported. But already it is amazing to note the strength of popular feeling on this subject of Royal grants. A stranger, knowing nothing of our modes of thought, would very easily be persuaded that England was heading direct for a Republic, so hostile is the language of the masses in relation to the demands which have been put before Parliament. The popular heroes of the moment are Mr. Storey, Mr. Labouchere, and Mr. Burt, who are leading the opposition to the grants. The fact that these gentlemen are taking an independent line, and are carrying with them a considerable number of Radical votes, gives opportunity to the enemy to speak of "the defection of the Radical party from Mr. Gladstone." A good deal is being made of this so-called split among the Opposition. The Tories regard it with satisfaction, as likely to increase the difficulties of Home Rule, and great things are predicted as likely to issue from it.

It is impossible not to smile at the fatuous complacency of our opponents, who are so taken up with their calculations as to ignore the rising murmurs of the multitude, which, if they have any meaning at all, threaten first of all the present Tory Government. The *Spectator* finds the rift in the Gladstonian party the distinguishing mark of the Session. The *Spectator*, naturally, never before found a divergence of opinion between Mr. Gladstone and the Radicals. The recent vote on Welsh Disestablishment did not, of course, show anything of the kind, and there has never been any distinction between the views held above and below the gangway. The disposition to find differences of opinion on the Opposition benches is fed by the wish for such differences. But, as a matter of fact, the *Spectator* and its allies know, as well as we, that there never has been

absolutely homogeneous views among the Opposition. The "defection of the Radicals," which is said to be the distinguishing mark of the Session, has even less foundation in fact than the chatter we heard last month, and which still is occasionally put forward, as to the conversion of Mr. Gladstone to a federal scheme of government for the United Kingdom.

The betrothal of the Princess Louise of Wales to her father's friend, the Earl of Fife, was hailed with a certain cordiality, as breaking again the practice by which our Princesses have taken to themselves husbands of German origin. Popular feeling upon this matter was unusually unanimous, and, spite of the fact that another Scotch nobleman was chosen to marry into the Royal circle, the announcement of the match was decidedly well received. Lord Fife is a man of ancient lineage and of vast wealth. It is said that he has a clear yearly revenue of £80,000. Naturally it was thought that this would be enough to maintain even an English Princess who might hereafter become the Princess Royal. There was consequently not a little surprise when the Queen's Message was read to Parliament asking that the usual provision should be made for the Princess. Upon the top of this message, however, came another, calling upon Parliament to give an establishment to Prince Albert Victor as heir presumptive. The two demands taken together rather piqued public opinion. It was thought the claim for the bride of Lord Fife might at least have been waived. It could not with any decency be said that there was here any pressing necessity. The notion which dictated the claim is easily perceived. A waiver in this case might have prejudiced the claims of the Princess's sisters, whose circumstances hereafter might be such as to make some Parliamentary provision most desirable. For various reasons, however, the public has come to regard its obligations to the third generation of the Royal Family as being exceedingly limited. It may be said at once that there is a general willingness, which extends even to the Radicals, to treat as a case apart the claims of Prince Albert Victor. Mr. Gladstone, and those who think with him, are prepared to extend the bounty of Parliament to all the children of the Prince of Wales. As between them and the Government, it is a mere question of method how this shall be done. At the time of writing, a proposal which is believed to find favour with Mr. Gladstone, is to add a considerable yearly sum, variously put at from £30,000 to £40,000, to the Prince of Wales's annuity, and to let him bear the charges incidental to his family. With this, as we are told, the condition is formulated that the Queen shall absolutely renounce all further claims upon Parliament in respect of her grandchildren. We have no certain information of what is passing in the Select Committee, and criticism is consequently a good deal hampered. But it seems clear enough that, whilst Messrs. Labouchere and Burt are against any grants to the

third generation of the Royal House, and Mr. Gladstone and the best part of the Opposition would limit them as just described, the Government, on the other hand, actively assisted, as we are told, by Mr. Chamberlain, are making play for the full rights of the Court. Precedents, going back for a hundred and fifty years, show that every member of the Royal Family, without distinction, save as to amount, has been provided for by Parliament, and there are the cases of the two sisters of the Duke of Cambridge, drawing £3000 a year each, to prove that princesses of the third generation have not been excluded. The question arises, therefore, whether precedent is to rule us in this important matter.

And here another set of considerations comes into view. The Queen, very wisely as we think, consented to lay before the Select Committee certain particulars concerning her accumulations from the Civil List. It has long been known that the balances from the various departments of the Civil List have been paid into the Privy Purse, and have thus gone to swell the private means of the Queen. The members of the Committee have been told that the aggregate amount of these balances during the Queen's reign has reached £820,000, and that her total accumulations since 1837 have been something over £1,600,000. We take the figures from the newspaper reports of the moment, and they are liable to be corrected by official information. It is to be noted that the private fortune of the Queen is not here in question, that the savings set out are savings which have been realized from the yearly allowances made by the State. The Radicals, taking the ground they do in regard to Royal grants, contend that the Queen's savings ought to be chargeable with the annuities of the Queen's grandchildren. They say that these are State funds which ought not to have been in existence; that the Queen has no right to reduce her state and to appropriate moneys given to her for the maintenance of her position; that it is clear we are paying for the support of the Crown more than is necessary. It is difficult to get over this contention as a whole. Here is a million and a half of public money, and the question very naturally asked with regard to it is, To whom will it go? We are told that there are cases among the third generation of the Royal Family where we might do positive injustice in refusing a maintenance, but the Radicals very properly point out that these cases can only be in the family of the late Duke of Albany. The Duke of Edinburgh, besides his Parliamentary annuity, has considerable wealth with his wife; he has derived a large income for some years from his naval appointments, and, moreover, he is heir to the Duchy of Coburg. The Duke of Connaught, who has the same Parliamentary annuity, is receiving the absurdly high revenues attached to the office of Commander-in-Chief at Bombay, and there is

little doubt that his military career will continue to be unusually remunerative. It is obvious, therefore, that Her Majesty's wealth ought to be ample to meet all cases of possible hardship due to the refusal of Parliament to continue a ridiculous system. Unfortunately it does not follow that either the Radicals or Mr. Gladstone will obtain a victory in this matter. For ourselves, we shall be content, whichever plan is adopted, so that it puts an end to a practice which is out of harmony with the times. It is out of all reason to suppose that we must persist in a bad system because it has lasted a hundred and fifty years.

Prior to this new excitement, which promises to add considerably to the length of the Session, Mr. Smith had made a second massacre of the innocents in order to get an early prorogation. He had thrown over the new Education Code, and three of the four Irish Main Drainage Bills. With respect to these latter measures, the temper of the House has rather surprised us. The Irish party were from the first divided as to the wisdom of accepting the Bills, but such opposition as they offered to the River Bann Bill, which was first taken, was of small account by comparison with the opposition given to the measure by certain English Radicals led by Mr. Storey. It was contended by these gentlemen that the works contemplated by the Bill should be carried out by purely Irish funds, and that this could only be done under the auspices of a Home Rule Government at Dublin. Some of the Irish members contested the Bill upon other and local grounds, and we have seen a resolution, passed by a Board of Guardians in the drainage area of the Bann, protesting strongly against the Bill as a mere waste of money. Mr. Balfour has, however, determined to proceed with the measure as far as possible, and, having on one occasion escaped defeat by seven votes only, he has sent it to a Select Committee. This Committee may or may not report in time to secure the passing of the Bill this Session. As for the Light Railways Bill, it continues to make satisfactory progress, and ought shortly to become law.

The main occupation of Parliament during the month has been with the Scotch Bills. With regard to Local Government, the two Bills which remained have been consolidated, and the Scotch members have been singularly successful in working their way with the Government. There was a formal debate in Committee on the question of free education. Mr. Howorth moved to omit the clause appropriating the balance of the Probate Duty to freeing the schools. Previously, the Government had consented to add considerably to this balance of £170,000, and had stated that the cases of certain of the poorer districts would have special help from the Treasury. All the while they proclaimed aloud that they did not intend to give Scotland absolutely free education. Mr. Howorth and his friends found little difficulty in demonstrating the hollowness of this pretence. To them,

the special grants to poor schools were conclusive that the principle of free education had been accepted by a Tory Government. Mr. Balfour struggled in vain to find a decent argument to support the contrary position, and, for an expert debater, made such a lamentable exhibition, that his speech was aptly paraphrased by Dr. Wallace—"We don't give free education; we only want to make education free." Mr. Balfour was, however, very valiant in answering the suggestion that the action of the Government must lead to free education for the rest of the United Kingdom. He insisted it in no way followed that, what was done for Scotland, should be done for England and Ireland, and, in fact, he gave one the impression that he would hereafter help those who threatened to resist the extension of the new system. When it came to the vote, Mr. Howorth was not able to muster more than fifty-two supporters, and the Government, of course, got their way. How far the amusing theory put forward by Mr. Balfour is sustained, is seen when it is stated that the total sum to be given from the Probate Duty to the Scotch schools now amounts to £240,000 per annum, and that this is fully equal to the school fees collected in the five compulsory standards throughout Scotland. All that is not free is the sixth or highest standard, which, being non-compulsory, is little attended, and will probably, in the future, be less attended than ever. That the Scotch members should be able to bring to fruition a great question like free education, which was certainly not within the range of practical politics six months ago, is remarkable, and shows how thoroughly the Scotchmen, at any rate, have obtained the essence of Home Rule. Or, is it because the Government cannot afford to have two Irelands on their hands at one time, that they have abandoned, without a blow, a position peculiarly suited, one would think, to defence by Tory Ministers. In one respect only has the course of the Scotch Local Government Bill been unsatisfactory. The Lord Advocate has been able to carry a new clause specifically prohibiting the election of women to the County Boards. This is a purely reactionary manoeuvre, though we are told by Mr. Campbell-Baunerman, among others, that in Scotland women have not much disposition to enter upon public work.

In the Government Bill for the reform of the Scotch Universities, the Scotch members have also gained considerable further advantages for the northern portion of Great Britain. Mr. Goschen has consented to increase the yearly grant to the four Universities to a total sum of £42,000, and he promises further help if the Universities' Commission, appointed under the Bill, have any difficulty in making both ends meet. The question of theological tests naturally came up, as the Government proposed to keep them for the theological chairs. The subject was warmly debated, Ministers making much of the fact that all that is required is that there shall be no attack upon, or any attempt to undermine, the Westminster Confession of Faith.

In the course of the discussion, the Government offered to refer it to the Universities' Commission to take securities for the propagation of sound doctrine by the theological professors; and, with this understanding, the tests were carried by 219 to 157 votes.

The House of Lords has done an unusual amount of mischief and very little real work in the interval since we last wrote. The Bill for giving constitutional government to the great colony of Western Australia has been read a third time, spite of numerous protests from the best informed opinion outside Parliament. The Bill, as it stands, is a glaring scandal. In giving responsible government to the 40,000 inhabitants of Western Australia, it gives also into their hands absolute control of all the valuable land within the colony. South of the twenty-sixth parallel of latitude everything passes to the colonist. North of that line, the lands remain under the control of the Home Government, who have full powers of disposing of them as they think best; but the moneys derived from the sales are, in one way or another, to be used for the benefit of the colony. The Home Government also take securities to prevent any prohibition of immigration over the whole colony. That a Tory Government should be guilty of the disgraceful surrender contained in this measure, is a striking commentary upon the professions of extreme regard for our Imperial interests which the English Conservatives always have on their lips. A more gratuitous abandonment of the interests of the masses of the people within the three kingdoms, was probably never recorded. It stands absolutely without excuse. To give over to a handful of colonists, nine-tenths of whom are settled upon the coast, the absolute control of millions of acres of fertile territory running inland a full third of the distance of the widest part of Australia, and to cloak this by retaining the more or less barren territories within the tropics, where European labour is impossible, seems to us an act of folly almost incredible. When we come to look at the way in which the local authorities in Western Australia have administered the lands up to the present time, Lord Knutsford's concession creates still more amazement. It is admitted by the Colonial Office that vast tracts of country have been leased for long periods for a mere nominal rent. We find that the Union Bank of Australia—to take a prominent instance—has a lease of 7,870,825 acres for a sum which is absolutely contemptible, and that there are numerous leases of estates containing upwards of a million acres. The State rental taken from Messrs. Osmond & Panton for 3,428,000 acres is just £1714! Another person pays the magnificent sum of £250 a year for just a million acres. Baron de Worms justifies these leases as being beneficial to the colony, but we should like to know the exact terms, and especially the length of, and the provisions as to breaking the leases, if any. It seems to us highly probable that the authorities who have embarked

on such a scheme of land administration, and who would become absolute masters of the situation under the Bill now before the House of Lords, are not very likely to begin a war upon these great land monopolists to recall the leases. On the contrary, the power of the monopolists, once responsible government is given, will be overwhelmingly great, and the leased lands will very probably be converted into permanent holdings. There is, indeed, a wide suspicion that the influence of the monopolists is at the back of the demand for responsible government. Lord Knutsford has had numerous warnings on the subject, but he talks, in a panic-stricken way, about the results of disappointing the colonists, and seems utterly incapable of taking any rational view of the question. That the House of Lords should have no difficulty in putting the Bill through its various stages, shows how disastrous a permanent Tory majority in the Upper Chamber may be for the best interests of the United Kingdom. Happily, the Bill has yet to face the Commons, and the Session is drawing to a close. We have a strong hope that it will not pass. Certainly it will not pass unless the Government are prepared, at all costs, to crush the opposition which will be raised to it on the Liberal benches.

Apart from this the Lords have not been doing wisely. The Land Transfer Bill was doomed from the commencement. The lawyers did not like it, and it was understood it would be quietly extinguished in the House of Commons, if it got as far. But it did not. The Bill contained a clause abolishing primogeniture in cases of intestacy. This was "the thin end of the wedge" to the landed aristocracy, and it was enough to send them into revolt against Lord Salisbury himself. At the first attack of its opponents, the Bill escaped by nine votes only. Then Lord Bath challenged the clause which proposed that land, like personalty, should remain in the hands of the executors for a year, and he was successful by 122 to 113 votes. Lord Salisbury's appeal to the wisdom of the House was flung to the winds, and primogeniture was saved. At the time of writing, the Peers are still in a fighting mood. If we may believe all we hear, they are for striking the Free Education clauses out of the Scotch Local Government Bill, and for omitting also the clause in the Prevention of Cruelty to Children Bill, which prohibits the employment of children under ten years of age in theatres and other places licensed for public entertainment. The last provision was desperately fought in the House of Commons, and carried, largely by the help of the Tories, in two divisions. Naturally it has given great offence to the theatrical people, who take it as a slight upon their reputation. But, as a matter of fact, it is only another application of the Factory Acts to infant labour, and the Bill, which also prohibits the employment of young children in the sale of newspapers in the streets after 8 P.M., is not less "hard"

upon the Press. To wind up the legislative work of the month, it may be added that the Government have elected to proceed with the Bill for facilitating the collection of tithe from Nonconformist farmers in Wales, and have left to chance the much more important matters of Intermediate Education in Wales and Technical Education for England and Wales.¹ To pass the last two measures is impossible without a full acceptance of amendments by the Government. And these amendments are altogether too much for the Liberal stomach. For instance, it is insisted in respect to technical education that the local authorities shall have power to vote public moneys both to Board and voluntary schools, although there is to be no sort of control over the grants given to the latter class of schools. If the Education Department stick to this condition, it is certain that the Technical Education Bill will again be among the remanets of the Session. The Corporation of the City of London have got Parliament to agree to an extension of the London Coal Dues for another year, though the amount of the tax has been reduced to 4*d.* a ton, and it is understood that the revenue is to be applied solely to the extinction of the debt on the Holborn Valley improvements which were undertaken on the strength of the Coal Dues. The City of London is in serious financial difficulty at the present juncture.

It is necessary to turn, as always, to the state of Ireland. For the moment, however, let it be said, that the controversy on the latest phase of the Irish question does not get on. Nobody, save a few enthusiasts in our own party and the Ministerial factions (who have excellent reasons for it) professes to believe that Mr. Gladstone is now aiming at a scheme of federal government. It astonished us the other day to find that Lord Hartington was among the number of those anxious to make a case against Home Rule by distorting the intentions of its supporters. We repeat, there is no warrant for the assertion that Home Rule on purely federal lines is now the goal of the Gladstonians. It is a convenient assumption of Tory and Liberal Unionist orators. It gives them a good opportunity for raising difficulties which, we admit, are very nearly unanswerable. Lord Hartington quotes Sir Gavan Duffy and Mr. Isaac Butt as being opposed to a federal scheme. They admitted that it was impossible, or next door to it, and that to put forward claims for Ireland which would involve a federal constitution for these islands would be simply to court disaster. For ourselves, we appropriate Lord Hartington's quotations, and agree in the main with all the objections he raises to the federal idea. Lord Derby puts the point in much stronger fashion when he says that it is absurd to encourage national feeling in Ireland, and then to bring her into a federal union with Great Britain, in which the great weight and influence of England

¹ Written on the 21st of July.

would overbear all other interests. For ourselves, we stand by our own interpretation of Mr. Gladstone's language at St. Austell, with a good deal of confidence that at the right time this position will be confirmed by Mr. Gladstone himself. Certainly, until Mr. Gladstone says he is prepared to convert the present House of Commons into an Imperial Assembly, and set up another and separate representative Chamber solely for England, we shall decline to believe that he had any such intentions. As to the condition of Ireland, we seem to be on the eve of a considerable change. Mr. Wm. O'Brien's appearance at Tipperary to ask the tenantry of Mr. A. H. Smith-Barry, M.P., to put pressure upon the landlord to keep him from interfering to the prejudice of the tenants on the Ponsonby estate at Youghal was a startling new departure, and, when it was attempted to put other of the Smith-Barry estates in movement against him, the Government thought themselves justified in arresting Mr. O'Brien. Then it was that the Irish constables in charge of the hon. member fired into the people assembled on the platform at Charleville, and injured two unoffending persons. Mr. Balfour stated in the House of Commons that the crowd previously fired several shots into the compartment where Mr. O'Brien was, and that they evidently meditated rescue; but this statement has been solemnly denied by Mr. O'Brien, and it is impossible not to believe him. Mr. Balfour's practice of defending every single act of the police in Ireland is having among its results a rapidly increasing recklessness among the constabulary, and less and less regard for the sanctity of the private person. This is inevitable, and it will want a strong hand to put back the Irish police to the proper limits of their duty.

The prosecution of Mr. O'Brien stands adjourned until August. He is to be charged with aiding and abetting the Plan of Campaign—which is in operation on the Ponsonby estate—and further with conspiring to prevent Mr. Smith-Barry to do that which he is legally entitled to do. It may be interpolated here that Mr. Smith-Barry told a deputation of his Tipperary tenants, who asked him to hold his hand against the farmers on the Ponsonby estate, that he considered himself free to do as he liked in helping Mr. Ponsonby since the tenants had refused a most liberal offer. This offer is, however, matter of much dispute. The deputation insist that there was no real intention to settle with the tenantry, that arbitration offered by the latter had been refused, and that what was intended was to transfer the estate to a syndicate (of whom Mr. Smith-Barry was one) and to "plant" the estate with Protestants as has been done at Coolgreaney and on the Massareene estate in County Louth. It must be said, however, that more recently Mr. Ponsonby has denied that he has sold his estate. We do not profess to sit in judgment upon this state of facts, but it may be pointed out, with respect to the case of Mr. O'Brien, that his action in advising the tenants of Mr. Smith-Barry to pull their landlord off

the body of the Ponsonby farmers, would be perfectly legitimate this side the Channel. It will be interesting to see what a Crimes Court will say on the subject. Messrs. Lane and Gilhooly have been drawn into the net with Mr. O'Brien, and the trial will be followed with much interest. Meantime the action of the Tipperary farmers has given Mr. O'Brien a new idea, and he has announced a Tenants' Defence League, which is to be worked on the lines of an English trade union, and the legality of which is to be unimpeachable. This new departure has been proclaimed by the enemy as a surrender to Mr. Balfour. It seems, however, that it is to proceed side by side with the National League, and is not to supersede the Plan of Campaign. It may be conceded that there will be great difficulty in working effectively a tenants' "trade union." The action of "striking," becomes legal only after due notice has been given of an intention to leave work, and we do not quite see how any serious movement can be directed against the landlords short of a general quittance of farms. But the Irish party are full of ingenuity, and we have a sort of notion that, in spite of the peculiar position of the Irish tenantry, they will somehow construct a system of combination which will not fail to answer the purpose.

The Special Commission is believed to be almost at the end of its work. Since we last wrote we have seen Mr. Davitt and many members of the Irish Parliamentary party in the box, but the great event has been the withdrawal of Mr. Parnell and his colleagues from their voluntary co-operation in the work of the Court. The time had come of which Sir Charles Russell spoke when the Pigott forgeries were revealed. The Court was asked to probe "the foul conspiracy" to the bottom by ordering the production of the books of the Irish Loyal and Patriotic League. It is in this direction that Mr. Parnell has always looked to discover the persons who instigated Pigott to his audacious forgeries. The Court, interpreting with great rigour the terms of the Act under which they sit, declined to make the order, saying that their only duty was to inquire into the truth or falsity of the charges, not into their origin. Upon which Mr. Parnell gave Sir C. Russell an instruction to withdraw from the case. This was on a Friday, and in the interval before the Court re-assembled, Mr. Parnell's colleagues had agreed to withdraw with him. Accordingly the whole of the counsel, who had so ably fought the case of the Irish party, politely informed the Commissioners of the instructions they had received, and have since been absent from the proceedings. Certain other Irish members of Parliament—including Dr. Tanner, a prisoner—have been examined, or rather cross-examined, since there was nobody to conduct the examination-in-chief, and at the end of three days from the withdrawal, the *Times'* counsel, finding it difficult to go on, asked the Court

to adjourn, pending the preparation of a statement which is to forecast his further line of action. It is to be remarked, with reference to the evidence of members of the Irish party, that some of them have frankly admitted they were Fenians previous to the birth of the Land League—that Mr. Parnell weaned them from unconstitutional courses. Being bound by the Fenian oath not to discover the names of their co-members, or the proceedings of the Fenian organization, they have declined to answer questions on these matters with such persistent regularity that the President has more than once hinted at penalties, but the *Times*' counsel has hesitated to ask for a committal, and the Court has contented itself by saying that the action of the witnesses would have "an unfortunate influence" upon its judgment. Mr. John O'Connor's expression of a belief that the authorities in Kerry and at Dublin Castle were cognizant of the fact that they were about to hang for murder certain innocent men, and yet did it, drew a strong reproof from Sir James Hannen, who observed that the witness put him to "a moral torture" in making such charges. Mr. O'Connor, however, insisted that everybody believed this in Kerry.

By arrangement, made before the Special Commission. Mr. Parnell has been able to go to Edinburgh to take up the freedom of the city offered by the municipal council, in face of a strong protest from the local Tories and Unionist Liberals. The visit was a magnificent success. If the *plebiscite* taken by the Tory party showed a great majority against the offer of the freedom to the Irish leader, it is now clear that the bulk of the people in the Scottish metropolis, following the advice of their leaders, did not take the trouble to vote on the subject. Mr. Parnell's reception must have been a painful revelation to those "currant-jelly" coteries of Edinburgh society, which have been so prominent in the recent protests launched upon this subject by the *Times* newspaper. And the Irish leader did not disappoint his entertainers. In a series of speeches, full of excellent feeling and sound common-sense, he demonstrated the solidarity of Ireland and Great Britain, and pledged himself afresh to work loyally and honestly any acceptable scheme of Home Rule which might be given to the Irish people. And one other thing he did which has caused his opponents no little uneasiness. Being determined to get to the bottom of "the foul conspiracy" against his character, he told the people of Edinburgh that he intended to move for a Select Committee to inquire into the origin of the famous letters. This Government, he thought, would probably oppose him, but, he added significantly, there would soon be another Government, which would have no grounds for concealment, and sooner or later the truth should come out.

The month has seen several Parliamentary elections. None of them has produced any change in the state of parties in the House

of Commons, and for ourselves we find no reason for dissatisfaction in any of them. We rather regret that Mr. Balfour's "polite letter-writer," Mr. George Wyndham, should have been permitted to walk over the course at Dover. It is possible the poll would have shown against us, but we are all for fighting this Irish Question out, whatever the result of particular conflicts. And Mr. Wyndham has been so intimately associated with the defence of the most disgraceful episodes of the Balfourian régime in Ireland, that he, at least, should have had no quarter from us. The most notable of the three contests which have occurred was that for East Marylebone, where Lord Charles Beresford retired. We are willing to admit that the pretensions of a local vestryman to Conservative and Unionist support were hardly likely to succeed so well as the great personal prestige of the ex-captain of the *Condor*; but, allowing much for the excessive popularity of Lord Charles, there is no explanation of the falling of the Tory majority from 1500 to something over 400 but a decided change of public feeling within the constituency. East Marylebone continues the record of all previous Metropolitan contests since 1886 in demonstrating that "the flowing tide is with us."

The visit of the Shah of Persia has created a good deal of popular interest, and His Majesty has been decidedly well received. But we altogether demur to the suggestion widely put about that the visit is destined to give us a great increase of trade in Persia. We have already almost a monopoly of all the available markets in the territories of the King of Kings.

HOME RULE AND IMPERIAL FÉDERATION.

THE question of Imperial Federation is not altogether an unfamiliar one at the present time. Few persons have not at least heard of it, and most persons have, it may be presumed, some comprehension of its meaning so as to attach some idea to the name at all events. The idea thus attached is, however, in the majority of cases rather hazy, and still more hazy, in all probability, are the minds of the general public as to the bearing of the subject upon the more immediately pressing matter of Home Rule for Ireland. Those who have thought at all about the connection between the two schemes, often consider them as proposals which in their nature must be essentially antagonistic to each other. They tend, it will be said, in precisely opposite directions. And it cannot be denied that this view has considerable plausibility, or that the questions are by no means so closely connected as to prevent advocates of the one from being strong opponents of the other.

Among the ranks of the Imperial Federationists are to be found pronounced Conservatives and Unionists, while, on the other hand, Radicals and Home Rulers regard all schemes for a closer union with distrust as more or less tainted with the infection of Jingoism. It is a striking and noteworthy fact that the leaders of the small group of politicians who style themselves "Radical Unionists," have shown themselves almost as violent in their hostility to any plan for the federation of the Empire as in their opposition to Mr. Gladstone's policy of self-government for Ireland. Mr. Bright's scornful denunciations of the former proposal fully equalled in their frequency and intensity his similar attacks on the latter, and Mr. Chamberlain has often spoken in the same vein.

Even that most bitter of all Mr. Gladstone's enemies, Mr. Goldwin Smith, though he has abandoned so many of his former Radical opinions, still retains his desire for the separation at an early date of the self-governing colonies of England from the mother country, and evinces an amount of contempt for those who imagine it possible to strengthen the bonds between the English-speaking subjects of the Crown only equalled by that of his abuse of those who desire to give

Ireland, in the smallest degree, the power of governing herself. We may also remark that the leading weekly exponent of cultured Unionism, the *Spectator*, has always opposed Federation as utterly impracticable and undesirable.

These facts ought to have some influence on the minds of good Liberals as helping to counterbalance any prejudice they may feel against Imperial Federation on the ground of its being advocated by Conservatives. They should remember that the President of the Imperial Federation League, who is, at present, the mainstay of the cause he represents, is a staunch follower of Mr. Gladstone; and, perhaps, on further examination, it may appear that Lord Rosebery's view, and those of the Liberals who think with him, are the most reasonable and consistent.

What, then, is the relation between Imperial Federation and Home Rule for Ireland? By the former is meant a closer political union between the colonies and the mother country; by the latter a less close and formal union between England and Ireland. So far, no doubt, it may be said that the two proposals tend in precisely opposite directions; but, in reality, their object is not so different. The general result of both changes would be to place the connection of England with her colonies on very much the same footing as that of the union of England with Ireland were Home Rule established. In both cases the newly established relation would partake of the Federal character, while in neither instance did an arrangement of this kind prevail previously. We must therefore, of necessity, consider carefully what is meant by Federalism. This mode of government may be most briefly defined as one in which several States independent in their internal affairs form a united nation as regards the rest of the world.

The objection, however, may be, and has been, raised that Federalism is always a measure of centralization having for its object the union of States, hitherto independent or practically so, under a common government. Hence, it will be said that, while it may possibly be applicable to the case of the English colonies, it cannot be to that of Ireland. It is true that, historically speaking, most Federal governments have owed their origin to the desire for closer union among their different members. Such was the case with the United States, with Switzerland, and with the German Imperial constitution of 1871. There is no reason, however, in the nature of things why Federalism should not be a decentralizing as well as a centralizing measure, and such it has certainly been in at least one remarkable case within our own times, the formation of the present Austro-Hungarian constitution in 1866. Here a union which the Hungarians regarded as too close, and which practically involved their subjection to Austria, was exchanged for a constitution substantially Federal in character, though, in some of its details,

differing from the usual pattern of Federal governments. The analogy between this case and that of Ireland is obvious on the surface. In each case we have a nation oppressed by a government which it regards as foreign, and, in each, a nation consequently discontented; and the Irish, with a considerable show of reason, point to the good results which have followed the granting of the Hungarian demands as evidence of what would be the likely consequences of the concession of their own claims.

Even Conservatives who, as a rule, profess the most utter contempt for the notion that the experience of other countries can possibly afford any lessons for the solution of the Irish problem, have so far recognized the importance of the Hungarian precedent as to have made desperate efforts to explain it away as having no bearing on the question of Irish Home Rule. These efforts, however, are but futile. It is ridiculous to deny that Ireland has an historical claim at least as good as that of Hungary to the rights of a separate nationality, or that she has suffered wrongs from England as great as those which Hungary suffered from Austria. The far-fetched explanations given of the origin of the Austro-Hungarian constitution, in order to show how greatly the nature of that origin differs from the nature of the causes out of which Mr. Gladstone's Irish proposals arose, only seem to demonstrate more strongly the essential resemblance between the two. It is not likely that any Conservative or Unionist will be disposed to deny that the union at present existing between Austria and Hungary has worked well, or that it has produced harmony where before there was discord. The Austrian monarchy is, indeed, among the Powers of Europe the special favourite of English Conservatives.

Though the point is scarcely likely to be raised, yet in fairness it must be admitted that an objection to Irish Home Rule might be based on some of the proceedings of the ruling classes in Hungary since they acquired their autonomy. The arrangement devised in 1866 has, no doubt, worked very well as between Austria and Hungary, but it has been by no means such a blessing to the Slavonic subjects of the latter, by whose loyalty the Emperor's throne was largely upheld in 1848, and who are now, all the evidence goes to show, oppressed by the dominant Magyars without hope of redress. This it might be said is an example of what we are to expect if England abandons the Protestants of Ulster to the mercies of a Catholic majority.

There are good reasons, however, for believing that the Irish democracy would show themselves more just and more generous than the Magyar oligarchy. And even supposing that they wished to act in the way the latter have done, they would be restrained by the most obvious considerations of self-interest. It is certain that England would not permit any such abuse of the power of self-

government, and would promptly interfere in the case supposed. The Magyars know that they can oppress the Slavs as they please, since it suits the Austrian Government as well as themselves to keep down all Slavonic aspirations, but most certainly the English Government would have no similar feeling.

We see, then, that Federation may be a decentralizing as well as a centralizing measure, and that it bears the former aspect as regards Ireland and the latter as regards the colonies.

What Liberals who are also Federationists would contend is that while the dependence of Ireland upon England has been hitherto too close and ought to be lessened, the chain that binds the English subjects of the Crown outside Europe to their fellow-countrymen at home, is at present too weak and requires to be strengthened. It can hardly be necessary to state, however, that the advocates of both proposals believe that the result in each case would be to cause a closer feeling of sympathy to grow up between the different populations of the Empire.

The question of Home Rule has been so often fully argued out on its own merits that there is no need to do so here. We are simply concerned with it as a branch of the general subject of Federation, and its consistency with this object has been already illustrated by a reference to the Hungarian case.

To consider now the proposals for the union of the colonies with the mother country, it must be admitted, as has been said before, that the proposal is looked upon with distrust by many Radicals, though it is difficult to see what solid objections can be raised from a truly Liberal point of view to the closer association of the English-speaking and freely governed subjects of the Crown.

The opponents of the scheme in fact rarely assail the principle, but devote themselves to raising exceptions on points of detail. There would, of course, be difficulties involved in the constitutional arrangements which would be necessary, but so there are in the framing of any constitution for any country whatever, and there is no reason to believe that they would be, on the whole, greater in this case than in any other. Objectors are too apt to confound difficulty with impossibility, forgetting that by the same line of argument it could have been clearly proved that many forms of government which we see in actual operation could not possibly work for a day. The favourite argument of impracticability grounded on the great distance which separates the scattered members of the British Empire from each other has little weight when we consider how greatly modern inventions of means of rapid communication have already shortened this distance in practice, and how it is likely to be still further abridged in the future. It does not now take a longer time to travel from Australia to England than it did at the beginning of the present century to traverse the distance between the extreme

portions of the United States. . And, certainly, the diversity of the interests and characters of the different populations of the States of the American Union were quite as great at the time of its formation as any that can be alleged to exist between the different English-speaking peoples of the British Empire. It is sometimes said that Federation would involve as a necessary consequence that colonial members would be legislating for the internal concerns of England; but, certainly, that is not what is intended by its advocates. The English Parliament would continue to act as the local legislature for Great Britain in the same way as the colonial assemblies in their own countries, while some new body would be constituted to deal with Imperial matters. Those who pronounce such a division of powers absurd and impracticable can never have studied the provisions of any Federal constitution.

It is probable that some influence might be exercised on English politics by the increased closeness of the connection with the colonies, but such influence would be indirect, and would in all probability be of a character which would not be objectionable from a Liberal point of view. For the constitutions of all our self-governing colonies are decidedly democratic in principle to a degree by no means yet reached in this country, even after all recent measures of reform. It may, therefore, naturally be expected that a more intimate union with such communities would tend to accelerate the course of progress on Liberal and Radical lines.

As to the fear entertained in some quarters that the colonies would be likely to involve the mother country in war for interests purely their own, there is little ground for it; and it must be remembered that we are just as liable at present to be engaged in hostilities on this ground as we should be in the case supposed. The only difference would be that in the latter event the justice of the quarrel would be determined by an assembly in which both England and the colonies would be represented. And further, the colonies would not, as at present, be exposed to the hazards of a war with a foreign power on the inception of which they have no voice whatever, though liable to incur a disproportionate share of its risks. The palpable injustice of this state of things furnishes one of the strongest arguments for Federation, and there is every reason to believe that the voice of the colonial representatives would be on the whole for a pacific policy. All the members of the Empire would be strengthened for mutual defence, while there would be little additional encouragement to embark in courses of aggression.

There are many indications that public opinion in the colonies is moving in the direction of Federation, and when the choice comes to be, as it must sooner or later, between closer union with the mother country or entire separation from her, there is every reason

to believe that the former alternative will be adopted, if the question is approached in a right and wise way on both sides.

A point which is sometimes brought up as a difficulty is the position of India in any system of Imperial Federation. Is she to have any part in the new constitutional arrangements or not?

It will generally be admitted, even by the most advanced democrats, that our Indian fellow-subjects, notwithstanding the great progress they have undoubtedly made in many directions, are not yet ripe for anything in the shape of national self-government; and while this is so, no one would propose that India should enter the Federation on an equal footing with the other members of it. At the same time it would be highly desirable that the interests of the native population of India should not be neglected in the event of the Federal scheme being adopted, and steps might easily be taken for securing them some share of representation in the Imperial council, a function which there are, no doubt, many among them quite competent to fulfil.

That the proposal for closer union would be beneficial to the Empire at large, if practicable, will hardly be denied, and the arguments against its possibility do not appear to have much weight. In what way it is inconsistent with any Liberal idea it is difficult to see, and if Liberals generally would bring themselves to regard it as the natural counterpart of Irish Home Rule, they would clearly demonstrate the utter absurdity of the charge against them of desiring the dismemberment of the Empire.

There is every reason, in fact, to believe that if Home Rule and Imperial Federation were looked upon as parts of one comprehensive scheme, much of the prejudice against the former would be removed from the minds of its more moderate and reasonable opponents. Mr. Parnell himself, with his usual political sagacity, has clearly recognized this fact, as is shown by his correspondence with a leading South African colonist, in which he regards the two measures as closely connected with each other. And if the general public should once come to look at the question in this light, there is little doubt but that Home Rule would become law without much opposition, and it would probably not be long before the Federation of the Empire would become a reality.

DIDEROT.

OF the three intellectual heroes of the Revolution, Diderot exercised the least apparent influence; he was, for the most part, too far ahead of his time, and his tremendous energies were frequently either concealed or dissipated in innumerable channels. The humane Voltaire, short-sighted, but so keen within his range, whose sarcasm was always on the side of benevolence; the morbid, wrong-headed, suffering Rousseau, who spent his life in bringing to birth an exquisite emotional thrill which is now a common possession—these two men stood out in the eyes of all, then and long after, as the standard-bearers of revolution. On the other hand, Diderot's great German contemporary, Goethe, the only man with whom he may fairly be compared, has during most part of this century seemed to us the inaugurator of the spiritual activities of the modern world. Goethe is still full of meaning; it will be long before we have exhausted *Wilhelm Meister* or *Faust*. Perhaps, now that we are so anxious to reform the world before reforming ourselves, we need more than ever the example of Goethe's self-culture and self-restraint, of his wise reverence for temperance and harmony. But even Goethe, with that peaceful Weimar atmosphere about him, seems to us a little antique and remote from our modern ways. Diderot, on the other hand, who grew up and lived among the various and turbulent activities of the city that was in his time the chief focus of European life, appears before us now as a spirit of the latter nineteenth century, at one with our aspirations to-day. It was fitting that his works should wait until our own time for the most adequate and complete publication yet possible, and that he should now first receive full and ungrudging appreciation.¹ "At the distance of some centuries Diderot will appear prodigious; men will look from afar at that universal head with admiration mingled with astonishment, as we to-day look at the heads of Plato and Aristotle." So Rousseau wrote, at the end of his life, of the friend whose unwearying kind-

¹ The handsome edition of Diderot's *Œuvres* in some twenty volumes, edited by Assézat and Tournoux, contains nearly a fourth of previously unpublished material, much of considerable interest. The *centenaire* edition of his *Œuvres Choiesies*, comprised in one moderate-sized volume, includes all that most people need read of Diderot's works, and is, on the whole, a most varied and judicious selection, made by such competent editors as Letourneau, Lefèvre, Guyot, Véron, &c. Mr. Morley's well-known work on Diderot and the Encyclopædists has done more than anything else to create an intelligent English interest in the matter.

ness he—almost alone among human beings—had at last wearied out ; to-day the prophecy seems in a fair way of fulfilment.

The whole life of Diderot, all his actions and all his words, everything that he wrote, bears the impress of his ever-flaming enthusiasm. That “*air vif, ardent et fou*,” which, in his own words, marked him in early life, meets us at every turn. As a boy at the Jesuit College he wished to go out into the world. “But what do you wish to be?” asked over and over again that most excellent of fathers, the cutler of Langres. And the young Diderot persisted that he wanted to be nothing: “*mais rien, mais rien du tout*.” He was not the last youth who, feeling the stirring of a deep instinct, would not, and could not, shut himself down to one narrow path of life. But to the men of this stamp “nothing” means “everything.” Then ten years passed, ten years, as his daughter wrote, passed “sometimes in good society, sometimes in indifferent, not to say bad, society, given up to work, to pain, to pleasure, to weariness, to want, sometimes intoxicated with gaiety, sometimes drowned in bitter reflection.” He taught mathematics: if the scholar was apt, he taught him all day; if he was a fool, he left him. “He was paid in books, in furniture, in linen, in money, or not at all.” When teaching failed he had to earn money how he could—as by supplying a missionary with a stock of sermons. Once he had to starve for a few days. That was not the least instructive experience to the youth, for he resolved that, whenever he could help it, no fellow-creature should suffer the like.

There could have been no better education. It was the seed-time of all his energies, of his encyclopædic knowledge, of his manifold hold on life, of his extraordinary capacity. He found time in the midst of it to fall in love with and marry a pious, honest, and affectionate girl who happened to be living in a room near him, but who was so ignorant that she once scolded him for the amount (very far from excessive) that he took for his writings; she could not imagine that mere writing could be worth so much. That he was not always faithful to her scarcely needs to be told; that could, perhaps, have been otherwise at no period, least of all in eighteenth-century Paris. There is a deep pathos in the brief story of her long life and her devotion to the husband whose own energies were at the service of any human being, however poor or disreputable, who cared to climb up the stairs to his room. In the early days of poverty she would make little sacrifices to procure a cup of coffee or similar trifling luxury for her husband; and during his last illness, though she would have given her life, her daughter wrote, to make him a Christian, yet realizing how deeply rooted his convictions were, she shielded him from the efforts of the orthodox, and would not leave the parish *cure* alone with him for an instant; at his death, the daughter adds, she “regretted the unhappiness he had caused her

as another would have regretted happiness." But we do not regret unhappiness; it is but another way of saying that life is complex and full of mitigation. In tenderness Diderot was never deficient; he was clearly a man of deep family affection; he seems to have inherited this from his father; so judicious a critic as Sainte-Beuve remarks that of the whole group of *philosophes*—not eminent, perhaps, in this respect—Diderot was the one who "most piously cultivated the relations of father, of son, of brother, and who best felt and practised family morality," and we constantly come across traces of this "piety." He tells us with great glee how, when he was once walking through his native Langres, a townsman came up to him and said, "Monsieur Diderot, you are a good man, but, if you think that you will ever be equal to your father, you are mistaken." His eldest sister seems to have had something of his own downrightness and solidity; he loves her, he says, not because she is his sister, but because he "likes excellent things." His only brother was an ecclesiastic and a bigot, but Diderot dwells on the inexhaustible charity by which this rather eccentric man had impoverished himself. At the latter part of his life Diderot's letters are full of proof of his tender love for his daughter, of the care and thought he devoted to her education, of the gentleness with which he sought to open to her the mysteries of the world.

At the age of twenty-eight Diderot conceived the plan of that *Encyclopædia* which became the central activity of his life. A few years later he published his first work, a free translation of Shaftesbury's *Essay on Merit and Virtue*, which indicates well the philosophical point from which he set out. It was followed, a year after, by the *Pensées Philosophiques*, a few brief pages, full of condensed and vigorous satire on the theologians and of robust faith in man and nature. Perhaps the most memorable is that in which he imagines that a man, betrayed by his wife, his children, his friends, retired into a cavern to meditate some awful revenge against the human race, a perpetual source of dread and misery; at last the misanthrope rushed out of his cavern shouting, "God! God!" and his fatal desire was accomplished: this account of the matter at all events indicates how little, even at this early period of his life, Diderot sympathized with the fashionable Deism of his day. The book was condemned to be burned by command of Parliament, but it was subsequently reinforced by still more audacious additions. So began characteristically, if with something of the reckless impetuosity of youth, a series of writings, far too long even to name here, many that were only published at his death, some that are only now being published, a large number that have probably been lost altogether—all marked by the same prodigious wealth and variety and eloquence. Yet they lie apart from the great work of his life. The *Encyclopædia* occupied thirty years; the appearance of the first volume was

retarded by Diderot's imprisonment at Vincennes, and it appeared in 1751; the last appeared in 1772. The *Encyclopædia* was more than an encyclopædia; it was not founded on that of Chambers, by which it was suggested, nor is it represented by our own estimable *Encyclopædia Britannica*. It was not a simple summary of the knowledge of the time, for the benefit of a community trained to appreciate the value of science. It was, in the words of the prospectus, "a general picture of the efforts of the human spirit in every field, in every age." It was the frank and audacious application to the whole of knowledge of new ideas, for the first time loudly proclaimed to a society slowly crumbling to ruin, but still by no means powerless. It was an evangelistic enterprise among infidels, with dangers on every side, and where one holds one's life in one's hands. We may still appreciate the significance of such a struggle. The future in every age belongs to those who can see farther ahead than their fellows, and who fight their way towards the vision that they see; but the risks are equally great under any condition of society, and some sort of Bastille or Vincennes is always at hand.

Diderot was certainly of all men most fitted to organize and uphold this great work and to carry it to triumphal completion. He said once of himself that he belonged to his windy countryside of Langres; "the man of Langres has a head on his shoulders like the weathercock on the top of the church spire—it is never fixed at one point." He was scarcely just to himself; with all his emotional vivacity and his readiness to receive new impressions, there was in him also an infinite patience and a tenacity to hold on to the end in spite of all. Both his versatility and his patience were called for here. He was indefatigable, for ever animating the waverers, stimulating the slow-paced, fighting with timid publishers, himself having a hand in everything, ever ready to suggest new ideas or to spend months in studying the details of machines or factories, or anything else that had to be done; knowing all the time that at every moment he might be exiled or imprisoned. The personal qualities of the man, even more than his varied abilities, carried him through. Some one speaks of "his eyes on fire and the prophetic air which seemed always announcing the enthusiasm of actual labour;" we hear of his "éloquence fouguese et entraînante;" and, with this, of his feminine sensibility, his wit and tact and fertility of resource. We divine these qualities in his head as it has come down to us, though his characteristics do not easily lend themselves to brush or chisel. He has himself some remarks on this point. In his *Salons* he comes upon his own portrait by Van Loo, and, after some good-humoured criticism, he adds: "But what will my grandchildren say when they come to compare my sad books with that smiling, mincing, effeminate old flirt? My children, I warn you that I am not like that. I had

a hundred different faces in one day, according to the thing that affected me. I was calm, sad, dreaming, tender, violent, passionate, enthusiastic, but I was never as you see me there. I had a large forehead, very bright eyes, tolerably large features, a head quite like that of an ancient orator, a *bonhomie* which approached stupidity, and an old-fashioned rusticity. I wear a mask which deceives the artist, whether it is that there are too many things mixed together, or that the mental impressions which trace themselves on my face succeed one another so rapidly that the painter's task becomes more difficult than he expected. I have never been well done except by a poor devil called Garand, who caught me as it happens to a fool who utters a *bon mot*." Meister, Grimm's secretary, who knew Diderot well, says of him: "The artist who would seek an ideal head for Plato or Aristotle could hardly meet a modern head more worth his study than Diderot's. His large forehead, uncovered and slightly rounded, bore the imposing imprint of his large, luminous, and fertile spirit. The great physiognomist, Lavater, thought he detected there some traces of timidity and lack of enterprise, and this intuition, founded only on such portraits as he could see, has always seemed to me that of a keen observer.¹ His nose was of masculine beauty, the contour of his upper eyelid full of delicacy, the habitual expression of his eyes sensitive and gentle; but when he became excited they gleamed with fire; his mouth revealed an interesting mixture of refinement, of grace, of *bonhomie*; and, whatever indifference there might be about his bearing, there was naturally in the carriage of his head, especially when he began to talk, much energy and dignity. Enthusiasm seemed to have become the most natural attitude of his voice, of his soul, of all his features. When his mental attitude was cold and calm, one might find in him constraint, awkwardness, timidity, even a sort of affectation; he was only truly Diderot, he was only truly himself, when his thoughts transported him beyond himself."

It was the inexhaustible profusion and generosity of Diderot's genius which seems to have impressed men chiefly. A small literary man of the time wrote his impression of Diderot, as he appeared in later life, with what is probably but a very mild touch of good-natured caricature:—"Some time ago I had a desire to write a book. I sought solitude in order to meditate. A friend lent me an apartment in a charming house amid delightful scenery. Hardly had I arrived when I learnt that M. Diderot occupied a room in the same house. I do not exaggerate when I say that my heart beat violently; I forgot all my literary projects, and thought only of seeing the great man whose genius I so much admired. I entered his room with the dawn, and he seemed no more surprised to see me

¹ "Timid and awkward in his own cause," says Meister elsewhere, "he was scarcely ever so in that of others."

than it. He spared me the trouble of stammering awkwardly the object of my visit. He guessed it apparently by my air of admiration. He spared me likewise the long windings of a conversation which must be led to poetry and prose. Hardly was it mentioned than he rose, fixed his eyes upon me, and, it was quite clear, did not see me at all. He began to speak, at first very low and fast, so that though I was quite close to him I could scarcely hear or follow him. I saw at once that my part in the conversation would be limited to silent admiration, a part which it costs me little to play. Gradually his voice rose and became distinct and sonorous; he had been almost immovable; now his gestures became frequent and animated. He had never seen me before, and when we were standing he put his arms round me; when we were seated he struck my thighs as though they were his own. If the rapid courses of his talk brought in the word 'law,' he made me a plan of legislation; if the word 'theatre' came in, he offered me the choice between five or six plans of dramas. *A propos* of the relation between the scene and the dialogue, he recalls that Tacitus is the greatest painter of antiquity, and recites or translates for me the Annals or the History. But how terrible that the barbarians should have buried in the ruins of architectural masterpieces so many of Tacitus's *chefs d'œuvres*! Thereupon he grows as tender over those lost beauties as though he had known them. But if the excavations at Herculaneum should reveal fresh Annals and Histories! And this hope transports him with joy. But how often in the process of discovery ignorant hands have destroyed the masterpieces preserved in tombs! And here he dissertates like an Italian engineer on methods of excavation. Then his imagination turns to ancient Italy, and he recalls how the arts of Athens had softened the terrible virtues of the conquerors of the world. He turns to the happy days of Lælius and Scipio, when even the conquered assisted with delight in the triumphs of the conquerors. He acts for me an entire scene of Terence; he almost sings several songs of Horace. He concludes by actually singing a song full of grace and wit, an impromptu of his at a supper, and recites for me a very agreeable comedy of which, to save the trouble of copying, he has had a single copy printed. Then a number of people entered the room. A noise of chairs makes him break off his enthusiastic monologue. Then he distinguishes me in the midst of the company, and comes up to me as to a person whom one has previously met with pleasure. He reminds me that we have talked about many very interesting things—law, drama, history; he acknowledges that there was much to be learnt from my conversation, and makes me promise to cultivate an acquaintance the value of which he appreciates. At parting he gives me two kisses on the forehead, and snatches his hand from mine with genuine

sorrow." Diderot is recorded to have laughed heartily at this sketch when he saw it in the *Mercur*e of 1779: "I must be an eccentric sort of fellow; but is it such a great fault to have preserved amid all the friction of society some vestiges of the angularity of nature?"

These impressions are confirmed by those of the Empress Catherine, whose delicate generosity in buying Diderot's library and appointing him librarian smoothed the last years of his life. She wrote to M^{de}me. Geoffrin: "Your Diderot is an extraordinary man. I emerge from interviews with him with thighs bruised and quite black. I have been obliged to put a table between us to protect myself and my members." He could not understand, his daughter remarks, that one must not behave the same way in a palace as in a barn. It must be added, in justice to Diderot, that Catherine was no lover of ceremony, as she certainly let Diderot know.

He was the same to everybody; not more ready to furnish the Empress with the plan of a university on the largest scale, and in accordance with the most advanced ideas, than to write laughingly *Avis au public* for a new pomade to promote the luxuriant growth of the hair. He was equally ready to throw out the brilliant suggestions which Helvetius and Holbach worked into their books, *De l'Esprit* and the *Système de la Nature*, and to assist some poor devil in tatters who, once at least, after he had long fed and clothed him, turned out to be a police spy; he was none the less bountiful to every comer. Now we see him devising ingenious ruses to obtain succour for a nobleman's forsaken mistress; again finding a manager for Voltaire's comedy, the *Dépositaire*, or revising Galiani's *Dialogues* on the wheat trade. The Dauphin dies; a monument must be erected to him in Sens Cathedral; Diderot is sought out and speedily submits five designs. All the men of talent and all the people in distress found their way to Diderot; dedicatory epistles for needy musicians, plots of comedies for playwrights deficient in invention, prefaces, discourses—no one went away disappointed who climbed up to that fourth-floor door in the corner house of the Rue St. Benoît and the Rue Taranne.

Some of his benevolent schemes were certainly of a rather dubious character; there seems to linger about them a touch of the sanctification of means by ends which we may, if we like, attribute to his Jesuit education. In his comedy, *Est-il bon? Est-il méchant?*—no doubt the best of his plays—he has satirized himself in the person of the hero, Hardouin, a man who gets into terrible scrapes with his friends from the questionable devices by which he tries to serve them; obtaining, for instance, a pension for a widow lady by pretending that her child is illegitimate, and causing an obdurate mother to acquiesce eagerly in the marriage of her daughter by delicately suggesting

that she has already been seduced. We find Diderot carrying on various benevolent little intrigues of this kind when we read his letters to Mdlle. Voland.

These letters to Mdlle. Voland form the most characteristic and intimately personal record of himself that Diderot left. He was forty years old when the correspondence began, and it lasted for more than twenty years. Of Sophie Voland almost nothing is known; we only catch glimpses of her as a woman of wide sympathies and decided intelligence, neither very young nor pretty, and wearing spectacles; she lived with her family, who were clearly more orthodox and conventional than herself, and must not, as Diderot frequently hints, see everything that he writes. Of the depth and reality of his affection for her there is no doubt; his editors have discussed the question as to whether this affection was throughout of the nature of friendship only, or whether, according to the phrase of Sainte-Beuve, an hour's passion had served as the golden key to the most precious and intimate secrets of friendship. This may be as it will; Diderot had found some one in whose presence he could show himself, without reserve or precaution, on every side of his manifold nature, and he was always tenderly grateful to the woman who had procured him this sweetest of pleasures. "My Sophie is both man and woman," he wrote to her, "when she pleases;" as such he always addressed her, pouring out recklessly all that happened to be in his head, narrating the incidents of the day, telling what he was thinking about or projecting, repeating current scandal or sometimes not quite decent story, flashing instinctively into wise or witty reflection; always with a swift, almost unconscious pen, repeating now and again what he has already said. It is only in these letters, where he is, as he says, "rendering an account of all the moments of a life that belongs to you," that we realize the personal charm, the exuberant strength and at the same time the weakness, of the man who in the midst of his manifold energies bursts out: "A delicious repose, a sweet book to read, a walk in some open and solitary spot, a conversation in which one discloses all one's heart, a strong emotion that brings the tears to one's eyes and makes the heart beat faster, whether it comes of some tale of generous action or of a sentiment of tenderness, of health, of gaiety, of liberty, of indolence—there is the true happiness, nor shall I ever know any other."

The *Encyclopædia* seems to us to-day but a small portion of the achievement of Diderot's life, though it represents the part that he played in relation to the science of his time. His place in science has sometimes been wrongly stated. It has been said, for instance, that he anticipated Lamarck and Darwin. It is true that he wrote, "The need produces the organ; the organization determines the function," and that this contains the germ of Lamarck's doctrine;

and again, "The world is the abode of the strong," and that this may be said to be the germ of the doctrine of natural selection; but at both points he was simply putting into epigrammatic form the conceptions of the greatest scientific genius of his age and country, Buffon, the only man of that time who was cast in the same massive mould, and to whom Diderot could turn with fraternal delight and admiration. It is to Buffon also, and not to Diderot, that the honour of anticipating Lyell belongs. It is in his Baconian thoughts on the interpretation of nature, and again in such a comprehensive collection of data as his notes on physiology, discovered of recent years, that Diderot's searching and inquisitive scientific spirit appears. He frequently startles us by the way in which he vividly realizes and follows out to their legitimate conclusions those floating ideas of his time which we are working out to-day. Above all, and from the first, he clearly grasps the fundamental value of the human body and its processes in the interpretation of mental phenomena; in one of his comparatively early works, the *Lettre sur les Aveugles*, he remarks that he has never doubted that "our most purely intellectual ideas are closely related to the conformation of our bodies." "How difficult it is," he says elsewhere, "to be a good philosopher and a good moralist without being anatomist, naturalist, physiologist, and doctor." Holding firmly by this clue, he was constantly trying to fathom the mysteries of the soul and to picture the processes of life; it is because he has realized that this can only be done fruitfully from the physiological side that the *Rêve de d'Alembert*, his most brilliant effort in this direction, is interesting after the lapse of a century.

He brought the same eager, impressionable spirit to his novels and stories. It is indeed no great step from *Le Rêve de d'Alembert* to *Le Neveu de Rameau*, and from that to *La Religieuse*. Whatever he undertook he carried out with the whole energy and enthusiasm of his nature, and, while this takes from the artistic symmetry of his work, it adds to its vitality and significance. It is owing to this quality that *Les Bijoux Indiscrets*, a frivolous novel in the style of the younger Crébillon, pointless and indecent, written, at the age of thirty-five, mainly to obtain money for his mistress, M^{de} de Puisieux, contains passages which are considered among the finest he ever wrote, and by its reflections on the reform of the theatre, its criticisms of manners, and philosophical insight served avowedly as the point of departure for Lessing's famous *Dramaturgie*. It was not until he read Richardson that Diderot produced any very noteworthy work in fiction; his admiration for the English novelist was extreme, but certainly not out of proportion to Richardson's historic importance. Richardson not only marks the first real landmark in the evolution of the English novel; he is the point of departure of the modern French novel, and Diderot, more than any one else, helped to make

his influence felt in France. Very soon after falling under the spell of the great English story-teller and writing his *Éloge de Richardson*, Diderot produced his most famous novel, *La Religieuse*. It is clear how much Richardson influenced this minute study, in autobiographic form, of the life and sufferings of a young girl forced into a convent with its uncongenial atmosphere and petty persecutions. It was a distinct artistic achievement, the more remarkable as it was certainly intended as an attack on the small vices of a community of women isolated from the world. Even those parts of this attack which have been considered questionable are always in the tone of the unsuspecting young girl who writes them, and only become offensive when a modern editor removes them in order to substitute asterisks; compare these passages with the more ostentatious propriety and zeal for virtue of a modern Parisian in *Mademoiselle Giraud ma Femme*. A year later Diderot wrote an unquestionable artistic masterpiece, only preserved for us by a happy chance, *Le Neveu de Rameau*, a dialogue of unflinching spirit between himself and a strange social parasite whom he is analysing. Some years later he fell under the influence of Sterne; *Jacques le Fataliste*, so attractive to Goethe and many others, was the result. But he had no great affinity for the sinuous humour of Sterne, and, while he threw himself into it with his usual energy, the result, though Shandean enough, is less happy than his great Richardsonian effort. Yet *Jacques le Fataliste* contains the *Histoire de Mme. de la Pommeraye*, and this little *histoire*, when disentangled from the manifold episodes which interrupt the hostess of the inn who tells it, is Diderot's most perfect and most characteristic effort as a story-teller. Even in his novels it is the directness and the veracity of his scientific spirit, united to his emotional impressionability, which gives charm to his work.

The same features mark his plays, though here the result has ceased to be pleasing, and we may be permitted to-day not to read through the *Fils Naturel* and the *Père de Famille*. Yet we must not forget that from them is dated the modern drama, with the notes of sincerity and simple realism, peculiar then to Diderot, which nowadays have become a more common possession. Diderot's dramas produced a great and immediate effect in Germany, on Goethe and Schiller, as well as on Iffland and Kotzebue, and the *Père de Famille* was translated by Lessing.

As a critic of the stage Diderot has, perhaps, attracted exaggerated attention, though he has not escaped misunderstanding, most people's knowledge of his opinions on this head beginning and ending with the *Paradoxe sur le Comédien*. Diderot at first attributed, as from the nature of his temperament he was sure to do, the chief part in acting to emotion and sensibility; in time he outgrew this youthful opinion, and in the *Paradoxe* he emphasized as strongly as he could the part of study and reflection in the actor's art, a part which must

always be of the first importance, notwithstanding all the tears shed by charming actresses, and carefully bottled for controversial purposes. Diderot was far too sane and many-sided to see only one aspect of so complex an art as the actor's; it is, as he says, "study, reflection, passion, sensibility, the true imitation of nature," which go to make up good acting. An interesting and too brief series of letters to Mdlle. Jodin is well worth reading from this point of view. Mdlle. Jodin, the daughter of an old friend of his, was a rather wild and impetuous young lady of some talent who had suddenly adopted the life of an actress. Diderot performed many small services both for her and her mother, and wrote her letters full of wise and, it appears, much-needed counsel as to her conduct both on and off the stage. "Mademoiselle," he writes, "there is nothing good in this world but that which is true; be true, then, on the stage, true off the stage. . . . An actor who has nothing but sense and judgment is cold; one who has nothing but *verve* and sensibility is mad. It is a certain temperament of mingled good sense and warmth which makes men sublime; on the stage and in the world he who shows more than he feels makes us laugh instead of touching us."

Diderot inaugurated modern art criticism by the notices of the pictures in the Salon, which he wrote during many years for *Grimm's Correspondence*. One cannot help regretting that he was not born among a greater group of artists. Chardin we still esteem, and Greuze is at the height of his popularity, but it is difficult to take more than an antiquarian interest in Boucher, and who cares now for Louthembourg or Van Loo? Even before the elder Vernet, whose variety, freshness, and love of nature appealed so strongly to Diderot, it requires an effort to be sympathetic. Diderot sometimes criticizes with severity—as occasionally when he is dealing with Boucher—but the tone of his criticism, as generally happens with contemporary criticism, seems to us to-day pitched altogether too high. In one respect, at all events, it is unlike most old appreciations of now neglected pictures; it is generally delightful to read, perhaps sometimes more delightful than the picture can ever have seemed. One suspects that Diderot treated pictures like books; Holbach, having read a book he had warmly recommended, came to him to say that the book contained nothing of which he had spoken. "Well," replied Diderot, "if it wasn't there it ought to have been there."

Everything that Diderot touched he vitalized. There were few things that he left untouched. There were very few roads of modern life on which he was not an enthusiastic and often audacious pioneer. He seems to have known instinctively the things that we are laboriously learning. So it is with politics, sexual morality, various social and politico-economical questions, education, philosophy. He touched all the social questions which absorb our

attention to-day. He approached the problem of the place of the workers in society in the same temper in which we approach it, and the practical knowledge of industries and industrial life which he had obtained in order to write some of his most remarkable articles in the *Encyclopædia* gave him some right to be heard.

His views on education, chiefly expressed in the *Plan d'une Université pour le Gouvernement de Russie*, are on a level with the most advanced views to-day. The education he demands is free and compulsory, and he is in favour of giving children free meals at school. He censures classical teaching, advocates professional education and instruction in the natural sciences, "the study of things rather than the study of words." "I think," he says, "that we should give in our schools something of all the knowledge necessary to a citizen, from legislation to the mechanical arts, and in these mechanical arts I include the occupations of the lowest class of citizens. The spectacle of human industry is in itself large and satisfying, and it is good to know the different ways in which each contributes to the advantages of society. This kind of knowledge is attractive to children, who are naturally inquisitive." Certainly, from more than one point of view, such an element in education would have an important social significance.

Of the functions and position of women—in most countries, he remarks, that of idiot children—he speaks often, shrewdly indeed, yet with peculiar sympathy. The most important expression of his opinions on sexual morality is contained in the *Supplément au Voyage de Bougainville*. Bougainville, the first Frenchman to sail round the world, had visited the lovely island of Tahiti, and brought back a strange and vivid picture of the idyllic innocence and frank licence that existed there. Diderot was aroused to set forth his views on sexual questions with that union of fiery enthusiasm, uncompromising thoroughness, and the saving grace of humorous good sense which always characterize him. He imagines a dialogue between the chaplain of Bougainville's expedition and Orou, a Tahitian, who is anxious to know why the chaplain refuses to conform to the customs of the country. The worthy chaplain represents the morality of civilized Europe, and Orou, with a few questions concerning this morality, easily succeeds in confounding him and in pouring keen ridicule on the inconsistencies of European morals. With reference to rules of conduct which vary with the country and the time, Diderot makes Orou say, "We must have a surer rule, and what shall this rule be? Do you know any other than the good of the community and the advantage of the individual?" "You were unhappy," he remarks again to the chaplain, "when I presented to you last night my two daughters and my wife; you exclaimed, 'But my religion! my office!' Do you wish to know what in every time and place is good and bad? Concern yourself with the nature of things and

of actions, and with your relations to your fellows. Consider the influence of your conduct on yourself and on the community. You are mad if you think that there is anything in the universe, above or below, which can add to or take from the laws of nature." That rule, he explains, is the polar star on the path of life, and the invention of crimes, punishments, and remorse will only obscure it. "In founding morality on the relationships which must always subsist between men, the religious law becomes perhaps superfluous; and the civil law should only be the enunciation of the law of nature, which we bear engraved on our hearts, and which must always be the strongest." At the end Diderot intervenes with a counsel of moderation and practical wisdom: "What shall we do, then? We will protest against foolish laws until they are reformed; meanwhile we will submit. He who by his private authority breaks a bad law authorizes others to break good laws. There is less inconvenience in being mad with the mad than in being wise by oneself. Let us say to ourselves, let us proclaim incessantly, that shame, punishment, and ignominy have been attached to actions which in themselves are innocent. But do not let us commit them; for shame, punishment, and ignominy are themselves the worst of evils."

"Every century has its own spirit; that of ours seems to be liberty." So in 1776, when men were beginning to say that it was time to burn philosophers instead of their books, and a boy of eighteen was actually burned, Diderot wrote to Voltaire, in the famous letter in which he announced that in spite of all he would stay in Paris, among the enemies of liberty, to carry on his own mission. Timidity in political matters would have been excusable in Diderot's day, and existed even among the men of his own set. Helvetius, for instance, advocated the advantages of paternal government and benevolent despotism; with his usual keen and vigorous good sense, Diderot shows how unreal these advantages are. When we give a ruler absolute power to do good, we cannot prevent him assuming also an absolute power to do evil. Moreover, as Diderot insisted, it is not possible to make people good against their wills, nor is it desirable to treat men like sheep. "If they say, 'We are well enough here,' or if, even, they say, 'We are not well here, but we will stay,' let us try to enlighten them, to undeceive them, to bring them to saner views by persuasion, but never by force." "The arbitrary government of a just and enlightened prince is always bad." He insists, again and again, that we must never let our pretended masters do good to us against our wills. "Whenever you see the sovereign authority in a country extending beyond the region of police, you may say that that country is badly governed." Diderot, Goethe, Adam Smith, Beccaria, Mill, to mention but a few typical names, threw all the weight of their influence, sometimes with passionate emphasis, on the side of individuality and freedom, and their teaching reached its final conse-

oration when Darwin accepted as his central theory the fruitful idea of Malthus. They felt, and rightly felt, that they were taking the step that was most needed. Those who advocated solidarity and social co-operation mostly went to the wall. Now it is the turn of the social instincts, and we must expect them to work themselves out to the utmost. We have to see to it that the truth to which Diderot and the rest fought their way is not meanwhile lost. The general will is itself to-day in danger of becoming a benevolent despotism, and perhaps the time will never arrive when such warnings as these will be quite out of date. When it is a question of the oppression of our fellows, we cannot always afford to wait until the offender listens to the voice of persuasion; him, at least, we must bring within "the region of police;" beyond that lies danger.

"Et si j'ai quelque volonté,
C'est que chacun fasse la sienne."

So Diderot wrote in some impromptu verses at a convivial gathering over which he once presided; it was a summary of his views on many matters. "I am convinced," he wrote, "that there can be no true happiness for the human race except in a social state in which there is neither king nor magistrate, nor priest nor laws, nor *meum* nor *tuum*, nor property in goods or land, nor vices nor virtues." This is the anarchism that stands at the end of all social progress, but as an attainable social state it is still certainly, as Diderot adds, "diablement idéal." He had no faith in moralization by Act of Parliament. "There will then be prostitutes?—Assuredly. Mistresses?—Why not?—Girls seduced?—I expect there will.—Husbands and wives not always faithful?—I fear so. But at least," he adds, "I shall be spared all those vices which misery, luxury, and poverty produce. The rest may be as it will be."

Diderot's robust faith in nature, that finest fruit of the scientific spirit, comes out again and again, here and elsewhere. "The evil-doer is one whom we must destroy, not punish": that is the great truth, held by a large number of the foremost men to-day, which is not even yet accepted. "Never to repent and never to reproach others: these are the first steps to wisdom." And, again: "In the best and most happily constituted man there remains always much of the animal; before becoming a misanthrope, consider whether you have the right." Not many men have had so much reason as Diderot for becoming misanthropic; few men have had in them less of the misanthrope. "My life is not stolen from me," he writes; "I give it. . . . A pleasure which is for myself alone touches me slightly. It is for myself and for my friends that I read, that I reflect, that I write, that I meditate, that I hear, that I observe, that I feel. . . . I have consecrated to them the use of all my senses, and that is perhaps the reason why everything is a little enriched in my imagination and conversation; sometimes they

reproach me, ungrateful as they are. Ungrateful ! would I could make hundreds ungrateful every day !” He never seems to waver in his faith in men, nor in the determination, with which, indeed, that faith must ever be bound up, to look every fact of nature squarely in the face. The words with which his letters to Sophie Voland close seem to be the constant refrain throughout all his work : “ There is nothing good in this world but that which is true.”

It cannot be said that Diderot performed any one great and paramount achievement. The most brilliant of his fragments—the *Rêve de d'Alembert* or *Le Neveu de Rameau*—is but a magnificent improvisation. He made no memorable contribution to our knowledge of the world. Nor was his genius of what may be called the wedge-shaped order—the genius of the man who, with every nerve strained to the solution of one mystery, never rests until the heart of it is cloven. His genius was essentially fermentative. He knew by a native instinct every promising germ of thought, and he knew how to make it fruitful. He was, as Voltaire called him, *Pantophile*, the man who loved and was interested in everything. His extreme sensitiveness to impressions was the source of his strength and of his weakness. In his sane, massive, and yet so sensitive temperament, aspirations keen and lyrical as Shelley's seem to blend harmoniously with laughter broad and tolerant as Rabelais's. The latent elements in him of fantastic extravagance were held in check by a *bourgeois* good sense in which we seem to recognize the shrewd old cutler of Langres. There is a profound democratic instinct in him ; his never-failing faith in nature and man seems to be a part of this ; it is a faith that may possibly be foolish, but for all those who are born men it is the most reasonable faith, and it has commended itself most to those who have been oftenest disillusioned.

There can be no doubt that the immediate effect of the Revolution of 1789 was to kill the spirit that Diderot represented—the spirit of scientific advance, active even to audacity, and allied with a firm faith in man and in social development. The party of progress were not able to recognize progress in the form of the Revolution, and the more obviously dominating movement of the century that is now closing has been the Counter-Revolution, corresponding in many respects to that Counter-Reformation which dominated Catholic countries during the seventeenth century. Putting aside a few stray enthusiasts, like Shelley or Owen, attractive personalities with little grasp of practical life, the men who have directed European thought, especially in England, have been men whose imaginations were profoundly impressed, and their mental equilibrium considerably disturbed, by that brief convulsion of France ; and they developed a curious timidity and distrust, visible even when they had the courage to adopt a short-sighted

optimism. It is very interesting now to turn back to the essay in which Carlyle, perhaps the most brilliant and distinguished representative of the Counter-Revolution, recorded his estimate of Diderot. How curiously old-fashioned seem to us to-day its mitigated admiration, its vague mysticism, its sneers at Diderot's loquacity, his generosity, his dyspepsia—sneers that, in the light of Carlyle's own life, have aroused feelings of pain, and even indignation, among some who in their youth looked up to Carlyle as to a sort of venerable prophet—its absolute failure to perceive that here was a man not to be stifled by a handful of transcendental phraseology. Yet this was at the time accepted as an adequate and even generous account of the matter. To-day we are again in the same position as Diderot, and we are able to see in him the significance, hidden from Carlyle, of the light of science fearlessly brought to illuminate the whole of life.

When men begin to say that everything has been done, the men come who say that there has yet nothing been done. We have congratulated ourselves that many sciences of nature and of man are in the main settled, but we are always compelled to begin again, and on a larger and perhaps simpler scale. In many fields of physical and social knowledge—from electricity at the one end to criminology at the other—we are now laying anew great foundations, and the walls are being raised so rapidly that it is sometimes hard to know where we are, or to realize what is being done. When science is thus renewing itself, and men are on every hand seeking how, by means of science, they may enlarge and ennoble life, the spirit that moved Diderot is again making itself felt. It is worth while to realize his fellowship for a few moments, and to sun ourselves, if we can bear it, in his inspiring enthusiasm.

THE RELIGION OF ROME DURING THE THIRD CENTURY.¹

IN most minds there is no little haziness in regard to the remarkable change which took place during the first four centuries of our era—viz., the change from polytheism to monotheism: to the average mind there is a gap, a break in the continuity of thought, and, unless the attention has been specially drawn to this period of human history, paganism seems suddenly to end, and Christianity—after a certain amount of persecution—appears as suddenly to become generally accepted. The average mind, even in these days of evolution, seldom regards the change as a process continuous with the preceding culture, and in part a result of that culture, which it was, from the fact that the pagan philosophers were trying to purge paganism of its grosser elements, and were thus unconsciously paving the way for Christianity by awakening new religious needs, which only obtained complete satisfaction in the new faith—Christianity. Dr. J. Réville, in his interesting work, entitled *La Religion à Rome sous les Sévères*, traces in a clear and lucid manner the change of moral ideal that was taking place in paganism during the third century. Dr. Réville regards the history of paganism, from the death of Marcus Aurelius to the reaction of Roman conservatism under Decius, as indispensable to the understanding of the triumph of Christianity in the fourth century. Although the author follows the exact scientific method—going to original authorities and giving chapter and verse for every statement that requires verification—the book will be interesting to most cultivated readers from its pleasing style and from the vividness with which it makes pagan syncretism live again. In the first part Dr. Réville gives an analysis of the blending of beliefs in Rome during the third century; in the second part he describes the three attempts at religious reform which emanated from the Court of the Emperors Severus. The period of transition may be roughly taken as beginning about A.D. 180 (though it probably began much earlier)—that is, about the death of Marcus Aurelius, and as continuing up to the time of Decius (249), who tried to revive paganism, and condemned Christianity as a recent and criminal superstition. It was this transition period that paved

¹ *La Religion à Rome sous les Sévères*. Par JEAN RÉVILLE. Paris: Ernest Leroux.

the way for the official recognition of Christianity by the Emperor Constantine in 325.

The period of scepticism had come to an end, and was followed by an age of faith. Old Roman stoicism ended with Marcus Aurelius, who, with his beautiful striving after perfection, and his devout meditations, has been fitly described as the most illustrious of pagan saints. Unfortunately, his stoicism produced a quietism in practical life, a quality the reverse of helpful to an emperor who wished to regenerate society; he was lacking in life and enthusiasm, he was too much inclined to contemplation and resignation—to a kind of fatalism, combined with a sad feeling of the vanity of all things. He asks, "If there are no gods, why should I care to live in a world void of gods, and of a Providence?" He looked sadly on the symptoms of the evils that broke out after his death; the actual misfortunes of his reign, the long and terrible plague, the civil war, the invasion of the Parthians in the East, and the growing domination of the army—all these evils tended to depress a man not naturally energetic. His quietism led him to say, "There is only one thing which deserves to occupy our thoughts—that is, to live with resignation among lying and unjust men without separating ourselves from truth and justice." Though Marcus Aurelius was a philanthropist, and manifested considerable activity in legislative reform, in ameliorating the lot of slaves, in restricting the tyrannical authority of fathers, in aiding the poor and protecting orphans; yet he allowed the Christians to be persecuted, because the people attributed the public misfortunes to them. He thus offers the curious paradox of a great moralist singling out for persecution that sect, among the many that swarmed in the empire, whose moral principles most nearly approached his own. Another cultivated man, contemporary with Aurelius, shows the spiritual emptiness of the old creeds, and the eagerness with which the crowds of deities from the East were welcomed by the masses. In his *Dialogues*, Lucian satirizes men and gods, and what men think about their gods; he ridicules all the new gods, some of whom cannot even speak Greek—the language of the cultivated. He represents the old classical gods as very much alarmed at the invasion of oriental gods and dog-faced Egyptians, so that an assembly of the gods is convoked to consider the matter. In another dialogue Jupiter is comically represented as alarmed at a discussion he has overheard between a stoic and a sceptic; the sceptic had the best of the argument, and was applauded by the people.

Lucian satirizes the popularity of the Eastern gods in the instructions he makes Zeus give to Hermes about the arranging and placing of the gods in their proper rank—gold first, then silver, ivory, bronze, and marble. Jupiter admits that art ought to be first—but preference must be given to gold. Hermes: "I understand you to direct me to seat them according to wealth and property, not

according to excellence and real value." "Come, then, to the front seats, you golden gentlemen;" and, in a whisper to Zeus, Hermes remarks: "The foreigners, Zeus, appear to be the only ones likely to occupy the first places: for you observe of what description the Greeks are—elegant and good-looking enough, and artistically fashioned, but mostly marble or bronze or ivory, while Bendis there, and that Anubis, Attis, Mithra, and Men, are all of solid gold and pretty costly."

Lucian's Dialogue, called the "Convention of the Gods," amusingly sets forth the cause of the convocation of the assembly—viz., "the intrusion of spurious and barbarous interlopers, especially Egyptian, the overcrowding of Heaven, and the consequent alarming and extraordinary rise in the market price of their ambrosia and nectar, and the arrogance and presumption of the new gods. A decree announces the meeting of the Celestial Chambers in the approaching winter, when an Inquisitorial Commission will be appointed for the thorough revision and strict scrutiny of the claims of the several more recent and surreptitious additions to the theocracy; when they will be expected to produce credentials and proofs of the soundness of their claims," &c. This dialogue is plainly a satire on the constant influx of new gods threatening to swamp the old Olympians. Momus, the Censor or Public Prosecutor of Olympus, is very indignant because gods of low or hybrid origin have been raised to the Olympian peerage, such as Mithra, the Bull from Memphis, the dog-faced Egyptian—not to speak of the ibises, apes, goats, and other ridiculous objects of worship stuffed into Heaven from Egypt. He asks, "How do you, Gods, submit to see them worshipped upon a perfect equality with, or even to a greater degree than, yourselves?" The reply of Zeus is full of significance. "The Egyptian facts you mention, of a truth, are scandals. But, all the same, Momus, the greater part of them are *allegorical*; and it is not at all right for an uninitiated person, like yourself, to laugh at them." Momus answers, "We are sadly in want, then, Zeus, of *mystic initiation into the Mysteries*, so as to know the Gods that are Gods, and the dog-headed that are dog-headed."

It was precisely this mystic initiation into the mysteries of all the various cults that did take place in the third century, and the veil of allegory usually did conceal some spiritual truth.

After the death of Marcus Aurelius, a period of dissolution and corruption set in; nothing restrained the free course of licentiousness during the reign of his son, Commodus—i.e., from 180 to 192 A.D. Philosophers and sages withdrew from society, and congratulated themselves on being able to philosophize at their ease. On the death of Commodus civil wars broke out, and nothing less than the iron hand of Septimius Severus could restore order throughout the vast empire. With the reign of Septimius Severus, according to

Dr. Réville, a new period begins, a new phase in Roman society: it is no longer the age of the Antonines—nor is it yet that of Constantine; civilization is no longer pure Greco-Roman, nor is it yet that of triumphant Christianity.

The great extent of the empire had produced in Rome an invasion of peoples, ideas, and customs; the process of mixing, and even of assimilation, had been steadily going on for a long period; classical ideas clashed with new aspirations, tendencies, beliefs, and practices brought to Rome from every part of the empire. In this chaotic confusion Dr. Réville discerns a few principal forces—especially Paganism, strengthened by Neo-Platonic philosophy, and supported by old Roman conservatism; Christianity, quietly winning its way among the masses, and aided by the religious aspirations of pagan society, in which a religious revival is taking place. Christianity at this time was also aided by the growing substitution of the social institutions of the East for those of Rome.

The period of the Emperor Severus—that is, the first half of the third century—is not, from the point of view of civilization, wholly a period of decomposition and dissolution. It is true that pure Greco-Roman culture disappears, the aristocracy withdraws itself completely from military life, and old Roman society is engulfed by the rising flood of foreigners; Roman nationality seems no longer to exist, society is cosmopolitan, the old distinctive characteristics are being obliterated. A decree of Caracalla, son of Septimius Severus, had given the citizenship to all free inhabitants of the empire, so that foreigners were on an equal footing with Romans. The old Roman type had died out, the Senate had degenerated till it scarcely resented the humiliation of submitting to the decision of the army in the choice of an emperor. The senators welcomed with equal servility Africans, Syrians, and Germans as emperors, because set up by the army. Herodian has said that when the high priest of an Eastern divinity, Elagabalus (Heliogabalus), was made emperor, “the Senate and the Roman people were sadly affected, but they submitted to the necessity, since the army had decided thus.” The army was composed largely of Africans, Syrians and Germans, who naturally chose emperors from their own nationalities. When we remember that the Praetorian guards put up the Roman empire to public auction in 193 A.D., when Septimius Severus was marching against Rome, and that they actually sold it to the highest bidder, Didius Julianus, whom they afterwards murdered, we are not surprised at anything that happened afterwards.

The empire consisted of such heterogeneous elements that government by force was the only possible one. The old cohesive principle of patriotism and nationality had disappeared, and new principles of cohesion had not yet been gained—hence the energetic rule of Septimius Severus was needed to maintain order, put down brigandage, suspend civil wars, and protect the frontiers against the barbarian.

It has been said that the period of the Emperors Severus was not wholly one of decomposition and dissolution. The government of the provinces of Africa and Asia was, on the whole, good. Many legal reforms were effected—for it was the period of some of the most eminent jurisconsults of the Roman empire; it was a government of the jurisconsults who were counsellors of the emperors—and Roman law is justly regarded as the most important contribution of Roman civilization to universal civilization. By these jurisconsults *Roman law* was transformed into *human law*, natural and universal law—true for all time.

Another element distinctive of this period, and preparatory for the next, belongs to the domain of religion. Amid the vices, cruelties, and exactions of a military despotism, there is a feeling after higher things, a desire for greater justice and purity, a longing for a moral ideal. The period of scepticism has passed, and a reaction has set in in the form of a religious awakening. Whatever concerns religion has the power to absorb the attention of a society dissatisfied and thirsting for a new religious life. The scepticism of Cicero and Lucretius has gone; indeed, it has been said that “from Cicero to Marcus Aurelius the Romans passed from incredulity to devotion,” notwithstanding that the scoffer Lucian lived at the later period. The scepticism and mockery displayed by Lucian simply serves to strengthen the assertion that “everybody believed and practised his religion;” he was an exception that proved the rule; he scoffed at and satirized the *false* ideas of religion, at the ancient gods with their licentious myths, and at the numberless new gods introduced from the East, thus testifying to the prevalence of religious feeling.

In the third century everybody believed; and this religious renaissance is a matter for reflection to those who think religion may be eliminated out of society, as an unnecessary element: the human soul has religious needs and aspirations, and will take its revenge, if defrauded of their satisfaction, by rushing into the grossest superstitions. Argument, philosophizing, and material enjoyment no longer satisfied the people; they were disgusted with disillusion—they were weary, and longed for some new ideal; and, as reality did not offer any satisfaction to this craving, people turned once more to the old gods—to the supernatural—for consolation and hope. A sense of human dependence on some higher power—which is at the bottom of every religion—impelled Roman society to the gods, as a manifestation of that higher power. But in the revival of the old religion, new principles were introduced in the process; these gave it new life, but they also transformed it. The paganism of the old Romans had been national, local, and individual; the paganism of the third century was cosmopolitan, universal, and syncretist—*i.e.*, inclined to blend with other religions. Each nation that became amalgamated in the Roman empire brought

its contribution to the common stock of gods, religious customs, and ideas. Each race furnished some variety of religious manifestation; each school of philosophy left its deposit in the human soul, its conception of deity, and its interpretation of religious traditions. Through the medium of the soldiers all kinds of barbarian gods were introduced into Rome, where they received a varnish of Greco-Roman civilization, assimilating them to some of the Olympian gods. From the midst of all these gods and beliefs, the idea was gradually and slowly evolved that they were different manifestations and conceptions of the same deity. The different gods became fused, blended together, and this unconscious and involuntary syncretism took place in the minds of the masses before philosophers and reformers made it into a system.

Never had the world known so many gods at the same time—gods of the East, gods of the West, Thracian gods, Gallic and German gods; old rustic gods of the tribes, young gods recently evolved out of the brains of philosophers, deified heroes of olden times, emperors deified but yesterday, the protecting spirits of the traditional hearth, the tutelary genii and demons of individual life—all, with their various attributes, were welcomed in the Pantheon of the Roman empire.

Dr. Réville very aptly puts the question, How did all these gods manage to live peaceably together? How did religious men conceive the co-existence of such a number of gods, whose pretensions thwarted each other, and whose attributes became more and more confused as they encroached on each other's functions? Moulded as we are by monotheism, we find extreme difficulty in understanding such a phenomenon.

At this period paganism was one vast blending of religious beliefs, in which the attributes and functions of the deities were melting together, while apparently they remained distinct. Though each divinity had its traditions, temples, and priests, they were so easily substituted one for another in the minds of worshippers that they seemed to be only different masks concealing the same deity; hence the individuality of each was unstable and fluctuating, and confusion arose from the analogy of attributes and symbols. For instance, a pagan accustomed to a deity with certain attributes did not in the least hesitate to identify a newly imported god having the same symbols with his old familiar god, though it by no means followed that the inner meaning of those symbols was identical.

Again, followers of a particular god were very ready to ascribe functions to their deity in order to impress people and to gain adherents, and they seldom troubled themselves to inquire to what other gods the same functions had been ascribed. Almost all the gods were said to work supernatural cures. The priests of the

oriental religions, personally interested in extending their god's power, nearly all claimed this power for their god. In time Serapis, Isis, Attis, and Mithra came to be regarded as all-powerful and universal; this fact necessarily led to confusions and combinations among the gods themselves. Take Serapis, for example: *Serapis*, as a healing god, is connected in the mind with Apollo and *Æsculapius*, who in turn is associated with *Hygeia*; as god of the lower world, he is a second Pluto, whilst, as a solar god, he is like *Helios* or *Sol*; and lastly, as supreme god, he is identified with Jupiter. The great mother of the gods, the Phrygian goddess, *Cybele*, is sometimes associated with *Minerva*, *Diana*, and *Ceres*, and the Syrian goddess; she is variously invoked as Mother of the Gods, as *Peace*, *Virtue*, *Ceres*, &c. Judging from the inscriptions, it would seem that worshippers thought it wise to invoke great numbers of gods, to be sure of safety and protection. Here is an example of such an inscription:—

“To Jupiter, *Optimus Maximus*, to Juno, the queen, to holy *Minerva*, to the Sun, to *Mithra*, to *Hercules*, to Mars, to Mercury, to the *Genii* of the place, to all the gods and goddesses.”

Sometimes inscriptions are addressed to whole classes of gods—as the military gods, the marine goddesses. Other inscriptions show that gods were associated from purely external resemblances: the Gauls were accustomed to worship a god with a wheel for a symbol; they identified their god with Jupiter, and, because *Fortuna* had a wheel as an emblem, they identified her with Jupiter.

If we try to represent to ourselves what were the various religions in Rome in the third century, we find—(1) The persistence of the old gods of Greece and Rome, and the ancient ceremonies in public and private life; also the *worship of the emperors*, for they, too, had been deified; the worship of *Genii* and of Demons:—

(2) The oriental religions which deluged Rome, brought, through the increasing communication with the East, by soldiers and merchants, especially from Alexandria and Antioch, two chief centres of civilization. These were the Alexandrian deities, *Isis*, *Anubis*, and *Serapis*; the Phrygian deities, the Great Mother and *Bellona*; the Syrio-Phœnician deities, the Baals, the Syrian goddess, the *Mazuma* of Antioch, the *Celeste* or *Urania* of Carthage.

Besides these there were the three great religions from the East, which were destined to exercise great influence over society—viz., *Judaism*, *Mithraism*, and *Christianity*. Of these *Judaism* and *Christianity* were too exclusive, too uncompromising, to influence paganism as a religion; they did not amalgamate with the other religions, which were idolatrous; and, in the case of Christianity, this uncompromising spirit was one great cause of its success. But *Mithraism* had a most powerful influence on the society of this period; it satisfied the religious needs of the time better than many others, and enabled paganism, for a

time, successfully to oppose the advancing steps of Christianity ; its influence was to give new elements of life and a higher morality to paganism which prolonged its life.

Lucian speaks of Mithra, as a Mede god ; but, before being a Mede, Mithra had held an important place in the Pantheon of the Ancient Aryans, as *God of the Rising Sun* and *Beneficent Light*. At a later time he became—like most old Nature gods—simply one of the personifications of physical and moral forces. Mithra underwent many vicissitudes, and, after a somewhat long eclipse, he took a new lease of life in the Roman empire of the third and fourth centuries. The Romans first became acquainted with the Mithraic religion in 70 B.C., when Pompey was fighting the Cilician pirates. During the first century the religion was treated with contempt ; in the time of Tiberius there appears to have been a regularly organized worship of Mithra in various parts of Italy : under the Antonines Mithra rose in popular estimation, like all the oriental religions. Marcus Aurelius allowed him to be installed in the Vatican, on the spot where now St. Peter's stands. The son of Marcus Aurelius—Commodus—was an ardent worshipper of Mithra : he delighted to intensify the tests of the neophytes, even to the point of causing their death. Under the Severuses Mithra was one of the preferred gods. Besides being a sun-god, Mithra was the god of right and truth, the guardian of leagues and covenants, the protector of life, and the pledge of immortality, which was his chief attraction to the Romans ; for, at the Roman period, his function of protector of the souls of the faithful was the central point of Mithraism.

In those initiated into the mysteries of Mithraism there was a joyous confidence in the future, which distinguished them from the ancient pagans, and which led them to devote themselves more and more to the future life rather than to the present existence. The most impressive of the practices in connection with Mithraism was the *taurobole*, a bath of purifying blood, practised also by the Phrygian religious hierophants. In Mithraic monuments the god is represented as sacrificing a bull for the salvation of faithful souls—hence the connection with the *taurobole*, or sacrifice of a bull, the blood of which flowed down upon the faithful follower of Mithra and cleansed him from every stain. Neophytes, desirous of initiation, performed various rites of purification and expiation, such as purifying the tongue from all sin with honey, washing their hands in honey as a manifestation of their intention to keep them unsullied by any evil or shameful deed. In order to render themselves worthy of the privileges of initiation of different degrees, they submitted to most terrible ordeals, showing that they were ready to endure anything so as to remain faithful to their god, and that they placed absolute confidence in his all-powerful protection ; for Mithra—as the vivifying

light, the author of all life, the invincible god—was also the protector of life, the purifier and the pledge of immortality, to all those who, by their firmness, constancy, and purity, had shown themselves worthy of his favour. By the sacrifice of the bull, Mithra secured for his worshippers a new birth in this life, which, according to the ancient conception, could only be granted to them at the end of time. Many bas-reliefs and amulets show Mithra helping one of the faithful into the chariot of the sun. The first Christian writers trace analogies between the practices of the worship of Mithra and the Christian sacraments. These might be accidental at first, but would probably be intentionally accentuated later, as each religion had a tendency to reproduce in its own ritual ceremonies that succeeded in another. Justin Martyr and Tertullian denounced, as diabolical imitations of the Christian institutions of *baptism*, *unction*, and the *Lord's Supper*, rites which were especially Mithraic, such as the lustration of neophytes, the confirmation of the initiated, and the consecration of bread and water. The Christian apologists very soon recognized in Mithraism a form of paganism whose concurrence with points in their own belief created an element of great danger. It is rather curious that the principal feast of Mithra was that of the returning sun, on the 25th of December, the pagan prototype of our Christmas (supplement of the *Encyclopédie des sciences religieuses*). We cannot touch on the special ceremonies of this form of worship, but may just mention one symbolical ceremonial, used to solemnize the introduction of a new adherent into the legion of the *soldiers of Mithra*. A crown, or a garland, was placed on his head; this he must push off with the back of his hand, solemnly declaring that his only crown should be *Mithra* himself. Henceforth he was bound by a kind of perpetual vow; he had consecrated himself to Mithra, even to braving martyrdom for his sake—and this was recognized by his fellows—by his refusal to allow himself to be crowned. From that time he became a soldier of Mithra, and fought against evil, to deserve the favour of his god; in proportion as he progressed, in the same proportion he strengthened his victory over the lower life, and his participation in the higher life promised to him by Mithra. Like his god, he aspired to be invincible and victorious over evil. The ordeals undergone by candidates for initiation were of various kinds, and calculated to give evidence of their strength of soul, their endurance, and the intensity of their confidence in Mithra. They were mortifications such as prolonged fasts, scourgings, dangerous combats, braving the flames, or plunging into the sea. It must, however, have been possible to compound with Heaven in some way, or how explain the great number of Mithraists—for all could not be heroes. Grand personages like the Emperor Commodus would hardly be exposed to very rigorous ordeals. There seems to be reason to believe that either

through accident, or excess of zeal, these ordeals sometimes incurred the loss of human life, and gave the religion of Mithra the stigma of authorizing human sacrifices. Commodus, in his cruelty, insisted that the priests should carry out to the utmost their terrible penances, till he positively made himself guilty of homicide in the temples of Mithra. Mithraism spread with extreme rapidity in the third century, and for a time seemed to endanger the progress of Christianity, which was also making rapid advances. M. Renan, in his *Marcus Aurelius*, says that "if Christianity had been stopped in its growth by some deadly malady, the world would have been Mithraic." But the pagan revival, and especially the worship of Mithra, received a check when Constantine made Christianity the official religion of the Roman empire; in 377 orders were given that the temples of Mithra should be closed.

The religious history of the Romans is indeed a series of borrowings, for, like the Greeks, the Romans assimilated to themselves the local divinities of their conquered peoples. The invasion of the Greek gods prepared the way for those of the East. Two Egyptian gods are always identified with two Greek gods—viz., Isis with Demeter, and Osiris with Dionysus. It is supposed that travellers and historians would speak of the gods they had seen in foreign countries in language which would explain fully the functions of those deities; to describe Isis as an Egyptian Demeter would convey a definite meaning to their audience.

The religious syncretism of this period, which began to develop at the time of the religious revival encouraged by Augustus, was really a vast combination of combinations which had been working in earlier periods in the special civilizations now united in one immense political organism. Even the Eastern religions were not pure. The worship of Isis and Serapis had been modified by Alexandrian syncretism, just as the Syrian religion had been altered by contact with Greek civilization.

Again, by its very nature, the Roman religion lent itself easily to religious combinations. The Romans in very early times had invoked a great number of genii and spirits. Without including the "Manes," "Penates," "fauns," and "sylphs," there were protecting spirits for each object of which they made use; and there were genii which personified the principle of each kind of activity; so that *division of labour* among divine beings was carried out to its utmost limits. The different stages of life had all different divine patrons; the different departments of a child's education were watched over by numberless guardian spirits: one protected him in his walks, one formed his will, another sharpened his memory, another aided his power of action, one helped him in calculation, one protected him against fear, and another realized his hopes, &c. Each phase of life—birth, youth, marriage, death; every important function of an ordinary career—as

war, agriculturē, &c.—had a special patron. The personality of these genii was almost wholly abstract, and was easily dissolved; they had no statues, no myths, no legends; they were names of deity rather than real gods: hence it happened that the same god was invoked under different names, when, in fact, only a different attribute of the same divinity. Thus Arnobius says: “You have three Jupiters, five Sun-gods, five Mercuries, five Minervas, &c.”

We know that the religion of the Romans was essentially ceremonial, attaching more importance to the regular performance of ceremonies and the orthodoxy of forms than to the nature of the gods or the contents of its dogmatic convictions. Provided that the prescribed ritual was maintained, and that the magistrate or priest did not mistake a single word in the recitation of the liturgy, it mattered little what they thought about the god; it was not even necessary to be definite about the personality of the god; it was even possible to insert in forms of invocation parentheses like the following: “Whether god or goddess, whether male or female, whoever thou art, or by whatever name it is right to call thee.”

After philosophy had destroyed belief in the traditional gods, the Romans continued punctiliously and strictly to celebrate the feasts and ritual in honour of the gods in whom they no longer believed. This laxity in the conception of religion, and the tendency to pandemonism which permeated the Roman mind, were causes which explain the ready welcome accorded to the new gods that were brought, always provided that there was no infringement in the strict orthodoxy of the traditional ceremonies.

Foreign religions spread rapidly, and were welcomed by the masses, unless their adherents condemned the idolatry and impiety of the national religions, as did the Jews and the Christians. The rapidity and importance of the process of assimilation depended on the amount of satisfaction the new religion afforded to the spiritual needs of the time. A society in reaction against scepticism was sure to rush into the opposite extreme of credulity and superstition, when the scientific method was not yet evolved, and when the critical spirit was in abeyance. No one thought of controlling the exactitude of a miraculous narrative, because the tendency to believe was very much stronger than the tendency to doubt. Under these conditions, and especially in the absence of serious scientific method, a religious feeling so imperious and exacting as that of the third century must call forth a plentiful crop of superstitions, and, according to historians, no period had a richer assortment of superstitions. Miracles of all kinds were passports to popularity, for the more wonderful the miracle the greater probability of it being accepted as true.

An example of the universal credulity is given by Lucian in the story of the impostor, Alexander the Paphlagonian, who, after a depraved youth, returned home with some tamed serpents, and set

up an oracle; he announced the approaching visit of Æsculapius and Apollo. Serpents were sacred to Æsculapius as the symbol of renovation. A new temple was being built, in which Alexander declared that Æsculapius would receive hospitality. To impress the people with the truth of his prophecy, Alexander placed in the mud of the foundations of the temple the empty egg of a goose, in the shell of which he put one of his tame serpents. The next day he went to the temple and invoked Apollo and Æsculapius: he pretended to find the egg, and showed to the wonder-stricken multitude the miraculous serpent adult and tame from its birth. In this way he gained a following, and called himself the prophet of the god Glycon. Crowds of devout worshippers went to adore him and to consult his oracle. He was able to cure diseases, to detect thieves, to find fugitives, to point out hidden treasures, and he even pretended that he had the power to resuscitate the dead: by mechanical arrangement, or by ventriloquism, he made his serpent appear to speak; when there was any mistake he insisted that the people had misunderstood. Alexander was a very successful charlatan; he duped a great number of persons. Strange to say, the great majority of his contemporaries accepted his forgeries; even in Rome the highest personages hastened to avail themselves of his good offices. In the war against the Quadi, Marcus Aurelius caused two lions to be thrown into the Danube in order to conform to the oracle of Alexander.

• If such was the state of credulity in the reign of Marcus Aurelius, what must it have been fifty years later, when philosophy not only tolerated and excused, but actually encouraged superstition?

At the present time we can hardly realize the condition of mind of that time—for people require proofs now, and the most credulous person preserves a certain reserve from fear of his sceptical fellow-men. Now people prefer to trace strange events to their natural causes; and, if that is not possible, they attribute such phenomena to the working of some *unknown laws*, rather than suppose any break in the continuity of known laws. But, in the third century, any one with plenty of assurance and some imagination might institute an oracle, like Alexander. In Lucian's time he complains that "Every stone and every altar gives forth oracles, if only they are sprinkled with oil and covered with garlands, and provided that they have procured one of the many charlatans."

There were various degrees in this vast current of superstition: sometimes it was a common charlatan who traded on the credulity of the people; sometimes the performer of the superstitious practices was the dupe of his own performance as well as the people for whom he worked the miracles. Sometimes the worker of miracles was a man who, under any other circumstances, was of undoubted

honesty ; yet, when it came to spreading beliefs and superstitions that he cherished, he would deceive his next neighbour with unblushing audacity. One might also say that, by force of repeatedly performing wonders, the performers came to believe in their own trickery, and certainly that the line which divides trickery from truthfulness became very much blurred.

The superstition of the wise men was covered with a fine philosophic varnish ; everything was carefully argued out and conclusively proved by logical demonstration. The belief in demons, genii, good and evil spirits was rationally accounted for.

Thus, the supreme abstract deity was placed outside of the world, not to be reached by ordinary mortals ; hence intermediary beings were necessary to intervene between deity and man. The pagan Celsus argues, very wisely and logically, that, if supernatural intervention were to alter a single link in the chain of natural order, it would cause confusion and bring chaos ; but when this same Celsus was arguing for paganism and against Christianity, in order to show paganism equal or superior to Christianity, he had recourse to arguments that would have weight with his Christian adversaries ; he appealed to oracles, to all kinds of divination, to miraculous cures, to the supernatural voices heard in the silence of the sanctuaries, and he attributed all these wonders to the instrumentality of the demons—mediators between deity and men. Somewhat analogous is Plutarch's idea. He held that there were three degrees in the hierarchy of the universe : first, the Supreme Being, from whom emanates all order, and who has regulated everything from the beginning for the welfare of human beings ; second, the providence of special gods, who watch the operation of that order, each in a special sphere ; third, the providence of day to day, that of the demons who mix continually in human affairs.

The philosophers themselves justified astrology and magic by very elaborate arguments. They also explained fate and prophecies ; but we may be sure that when magicians were consulted it was less from intellectual curiosity than from a desire to avoid dangers or to gain advantages. What was the good of knowing the future unless they could modify it ? People sometimes treated their astrologers as if they were the masters and controllers of destiny instead of merely being its interpreters, for if they foretold evil they were driven away. Dr. Réville says the emperors forbade the astrologers to be consulted on matters of State, ignoring the fact that destiny would follow its course whether they were consulted or not ; he compares the emperors to those romantic young maidens who pluck the petals off a flower in order to find out how much their admirer loves them. If the oracle gives a pleasant answer they believe it, and would not consult another flower on any account ; but if the oracle is unfavour-

able, they throw the flower away in disgust and take another, hoping for a better answer from it.

Superstition was universal. The East and the West alike contributed to the common fund, and the old methods of consulting the gods were still practised—viz., the haruspex, the auspices, the casting of lots, the taking at random of certain verses from Homer, or even Virgil, just as certain devout people, even now, open the Bible at random to find guidance in perplexity.

No one can say that the Roman people of the third century were narrow-minded or intolerant, for they gladly welcomed all kinds of deities and all kinds of superstitions.

The character of religion was changing: it was losing the element of bargaining or mutual contract between men and gods, which implied so much deference and homage on the part of men for so much protection and patronage on the part of the gods—homage paid in good and proper form, according to traditional rite and established etiquette, otherwise the gods would repay neglect by disaster, for the form gave the devotional act its value. In the third century religion was no longer a fulfilling of a contract between gods and men, it was an impulse of the individual soul towards the gods and the happiness they confer. The mind was in reaction against the hard dryness of the formal and sceptical period, and was impelled towards an inward mystical faith—longing to devote itself zealously to the service of the gods. The religious man was conscious of his powerlessness to realize the perfect life unaided by the gods, he needed and desired salvation. Many pagans longed for the assurance of a future life and for protection beyond the tomb. The works of various writers, as well as inscriptions and monuments, show that, from the second to the fourth century, belief in a future life became more and more general and more absorbing. The ancient Romans had believed in it, but did not trouble much about it; but during this period almost every one became pre-occupied about a future life—the people in general as well as the philosophers, such as Platonists, Neo-Platonists, Neo-Pythagoreans, and all kinds of eclectics.

Very little is known about the mysteries, but it appears that the initiated were made to understand the profound and mysterious meaning of the divine legends, and were taught how they might share the blessings of the gods and enter into immortality with them. The Eastern religions of Isis, Serapis and Mithra owed part of their popularity to their assurance of a future life.

In spite of the monstrosities of some of these religions, they all, even the coarsest of them, contain a moral element—viz., punishment of the guilty in proportion to their sins. Plutarch gives a model of a pagan inferno, with its triple gradation of torments, according as the guilty have more or less expiated their crimes on earth; in this

inferno there are persecuting demons, oceans of boiling gold, frozen lead and iron.

Cultivated men believed that good people rose from this to a higher existence, that they became demons and approached more nearly to the likeness of gods, and enjoyed the privileges accorded to demons—viz., communion with the gods, and greater knowledge than men, which enabled them to render services to men. Thus, the cultivated believed in the evolution of souls; they believed that this existence on earth is simply a link in the chain of universal existence; that sometimes a being had been degraded from a higher and more spiritual existence to this lower corporeal existence as a punishment; they believed that the future depended on the individual's present action—if good, he would rise; if bad, he would sink to a yet lower existence. The spiritual and moral element in this belief lies in the connection of the past with the present, the present with the future; the future destiny of the believer depending on his present conduct, just as his present lot is the consequence of his past conduct. Their ideas of the kind of happiness they expected at the end of their earthly existence might be vague enough; the instinct of clinging to life was satisfied if they escaped annihilation.

The growing pre-occupation about a future life led to a real contempt for the material goods of this life, giving rise to what is called the birth of pagan asceticism, which the teaching of Plotinus did much to foster.

A new ideal arose: the old ideal had been that of heroism, the new ideal was that of holiness. To be pure, holy, spotless was the highest aim of life, and the true guarantee of salvation. The highest and most desired epithets were *pius* and *sanctus*.

Dr. Réville shows how a new sentiment had taken possession of the pagan religious conscience—a sentiment somewhat akin to that of the Christian doctrine of sin, yet quite different. A Christian regards sin as the voluntary and conscious violation of the Divine will. The pagan believed that there were in human nature good and bad elements, or a duality of nature; matter on the one hand, the source of evil, and spirit on the other, the source of good and of life; the body with its passions, and the soul with its higher aspirations.

Instead of ascribing sin to a wrong use of liberty, as the Christians would do, they attributed it to the very constitution of nature itself.

The pagans of the third century regarded the union of the higher with the lower elements as the punishment for sin committed in a previous existence before birth on this earth. This feeling of the evil inherent in human nature aroused a desire to escape from evil and attain a more purified state. It became the aim of life to regain the lost purity without which there could be no communion with the

gods. The first duty of the religious man was purification, in order that he might reconcile himself with the gods and gain their protection in this life and the next. To this end men became initiated into the mysteries of the various religions, imposed on themselves all kinds of penances, lustrations, ablutions, &c.; as they had done in the remotest antiquity—with this difference, that in the ancient world the purifications were regarded as affecting the *outward being*, whereas in the third century they aimed at raising the *inner being*.

This awakening of the religious conscience is usually attributed wholly to Christianity, whereas it was already fermenting and agitating religious society as a whole. Therefore it is, perhaps, nearer the truth, to regard this sudden change in the religious conscience, inspiring ascetic morals and institutions, as the result of hidden forces acting alike on Christianity and paganism, and to say that both Christianity and paganism were carried along in the same stream, but that Christianity was better adapted to the spiritual and moral needs of men, and that it won its way by the noble and beautiful ideal that it offered.

The very existence of these newly awakened aspirations among the pagans made them adopt the Eastern religions, with their asceticism, because they afforded a completer satisfaction than their own traditional religions. These ascetic tendencies were by no means incompatible with a great amount of dissoluteness and sensuality. Excess in one direction very often provokes excess in the opposite direction. It is notorious that the festivals of the Eastern religions were characterized by excesses alternately licentious and ascetic; numerous ascetic practices—fasts and abstinences—were followed by moral disorders of the grossest kind. It required the influence of Christianity and of the Western spirit to separate asceticism from the shameful compromises to which in the East it was subject.

From the time of Plutarch to Porphyry the philosophic idea was to grasp the one constant religious truth underlying the various forms assumed by different national legends and traditions and connecting each with the universal religion. Owing to the absence of the critical spirit, and to the lack of feeling for positive realities, these thinkers blended the diverse religions into one vast fluctuating synthesis, composed of philosophical eclecticism and religious syncretism.

Plutarch, for instance, when writing of Isis and Osiris, expressly formulates that “there are not different gods for different peoples; there are not barbarian gods and Greek gods, gods of the North and gods of the South. But as the sun and moon light all men, as the sky, the earth, and the sea are for all, notwithstanding the great diversity of names by which they are designated, so also there is *One Intelligence* that reigns in the world, *One Providence* that governs

it ; and the same powers act everywhere—only the names and the forms of worship change ; the symbols which raise the spirit towards the divine are sometimes clear, sometimes obscure.”

Again, Celsus, the defender of paganism against the Christians, declares that “there is one God who should be worshipped unceasingly. But, at the same time, he recommends each people to preserve its traditional religion and worship its particular gods, for they are representatives, agents of the Supreme Being, and to each is assigned a special domain and special functions in the government of the world, just as officials and prætors are charged with the administration of diverse provinces in a vast empire. Honouring these gods is to honour the Supreme, just as homage paid to the representative is honour rendered to the Sovereign.” Another illustration will serve to show the delicate shades which distinguished the syncretism of the different philosophers.

Maximus of Tyre declares “that we are incapable of grasping the idea of the Supreme God, the Author of all Things, superior to time and nature, the inaccessible Being to whom man cannot even give a suitable name. And thus, in order to draw near to Deity, we call to our aid names, living beings, symbolical representations and elements of nature ; urged by the desire of understanding Him, we—in our helplessness—pray by naming Him after everything that is beautiful. It is most important to know Him. If the Greeks arrive at that through the art of Pheidias, the Egyptians through the worship of animals, others through the worship of a stream or a fire—what matters the diversity of their religions provided that they know the gods, love them, and think of them ! Their poetic legends teach, under imaginary and popular forms, the same truth that philosophy proclaims : Jupiter is always the first intelligence, the principle through which everything exists, and which everything obeys ; Athena is wisdom ; Apollo, the sun ; and Neptune, the breeze that traverses the earth and the sea.”

These examples show how the personality of the gods was more or less compromised, according as they were regarded simply as distinct denominations of one Deity—that is, from the philosophical point of view as abstractions ; or as real beings subordinated to the Supreme God, that is—from the religious point of view, as traditional gods,

There is a tendency to Monotheism of a somewhat accommodating kind. There is also the Pantheistic tendency. Neo-Platonism is said to be the resultant of all the philosophical and religious work of this period ; in it religious syncretism finds its most complete expression. What it attempted to do was to free that element of truth common to all earlier systems of philosophy, and to show that this truth harmonized perfectly with the truth common to all anterior religions.

We can trace three attempts at religious reform in the period under consideration. First, the Neo-Pythagorean reform of which Apollonius of Tyana was the hero, and of which Julia Domna, the wife of Septimius Severus, was the promoter. Second, the substitution, pure and simple, of an oriental religion by the Emperor Elagabalus (a religion which aimed at absorbing the Greco-Roman religion into itself). The third attempt at reform is the true syncretism of Alexander Severus—including all the gods, besides the worship of the saints of paganism—which encouraged a religious attitude of mind that helped to pave the way for universal Christianity.

During the empire Roman manners were relaxed from their ancient severity, and women were emancipated to an extent only equalled by that of America to-day. The third century is spoken of as essentially the century of pagan women; women who were clever, intelligent, and aspiring to the control of public affairs. In connection with the house of Severus there were four Julias, of whom Julia Domna, the wife of Septimius Severus, was the most remarkable. She was beautiful, ambitious, and cultivated; she loved to gather round her the most distinguished men of letters, philosophers, and artists.

In that great cosmopolitan empire—given over to the caprice of the army—there was little room for patriotism, and as little for public life. So that most of those who possessed any elevation of spirit gave themselves up to the study of the treasures of an earlier civilization in art, literature, and philosophy. Such men gathered round the beautiful Syrian princess, and when secure of her favour they felt safe. Among those frequenters of the imperial *salon* were many sophists: to one sophist, Philostratus, Julia Domna entrusted the memoirs of *Apollonius of Tyana*, written by one of his disciples, Damis. The Empress required Philostratus to put the life of Apollonius into a more correct literary form. Philostratus did so; but, being fond of fine writing, he coloured the bald facts, he did not confine himself to the account given by the memoirs, but made a new work, filling it in with traditions and stories about Apollonius that he had gathered in his travels, adding whatever seemed to tend to the glorification of his hero.

There was a Pythagorean philosopher, called Apollonius, born in Tyana about the time of the birth of Christ, and he by his way of life produced a profound impression on the people: he did wonderful deeds, he taught on religious matters, he probably travelled, and he composed some works, one the life of Pythagoras; he also devoted himself to the evangelization of his contemporaries.

This is the man that the syncretists of the Court of Septimius Severus wished to set up as the ideal man, the divine man whom they must imitate. The natives of Tyana declared that Apollonius

was the son of Jupiter; but Philostratus affirms simply that he was of miraculous birth, that he possessed power over the elements, that he could speak all languages without having learnt them, that he expelled evil spirits, that he transported himself miraculously to great distances, that he conversed with the shades of departed heroes, that when in prison he caused his chains to drop off by the mere effort of his will, and lastly that he brought back to life a girl supposed to be dead.

According to Philostratus, Apollonius is a most perfectly virtuous man, conscious of having a religious mission to accomplish, going from place to place doing good, redressing wrongs, reforming superstitions and vicious practices, unveiling evil, defending justice, and healing the moral sores of the individual or of society.

Having a more divine nature than ordinary men, Apollonius holds converse with the gods and acts according to their inspiration; he is their agent sent to watch over the laws of the moral world, and bring souls to a state of purity.

The Apollonius described by Philostratus cannot be said to be a narrow-minded bigot: he sees good in all religions, and does not wish men to abandon their traditional faiths; Philostratus makes him declare that all traditional gods may be worshipped, for there is a great number of gods who govern the different functions of nature, or preside over the different spheres of the universe: these gods are good and just, therefore to worship them will not detract from the worship of the Supreme God, creator of the world and regulator of all things. This Supreme God reveals himself as a god of light and purity; he requires no material sacrifice; the spirit alone is pure enough to offer him.

Yet, even the noble spirituality of Apollonius is vitiated by the most petty pagan formalism and ritual; he stops the earthquakes of the Hellespont through his having discovered what angered the gods, and through his knowing what kind of sacrifices will soothe their anger. When he has thrown incense into the fire, he observes most minutely on which side the smoke rises, what clouds it forms, where the clouds meet, and from these observations he infers the temper of the gods.

In the ideal created by Philostratus, and which may be taken as the religious and moral ideal of the philosophers of the Court of Severus, there is a disproportion between the pretensions and the reality, between the high aim which Apollonius sets himself and the petty means he adopts to attain it.

Some historians have asserted that Julia Domna and Philostratus—struck with the rapid progress of Christianity, with the devotion and faithfulness of its followers—conceived the idea of setting up a rival to Christ in the person of some pagan sage in order to check religious desertion from the pagan gods. These historians have

drawn parallels between the two lives which make the idea somewhat plausible. Dr. Réville, after carefully weighing the reasons for and against such a theory, rejects it on the ground that there is nowhere in the work of Philostratus the slightest allusion to Christianity. It is difficult to believe that a book written for the purpose of supplanting Christ by Apollonius would not refer to Jesus himself or to the religious society of which He was the founder. In the book there is no hostility shown towards the Christians, and it is said that the Syrian princesses, Julia Domna and Julia Mama, bestowed a ready sympathy on them.

What they wanted, these syncretists of the Court of Severus, was a hero of a moral religion, a hero whose claim to greatness lay in devotion to humanity, elevation of sentiment, and purity of conduct. They wanted an authority and a model, raised so much above other men as to command veneration, and yet sufficiently like ordinary men as to invite imitation.

So much for the first attempt at reform of paganism. We need not say much about the second, viz., that by Elagabalus, who introduced an Oriental Baal into Rome as the Supreme Deity, and insisted that his god should take precedence of all the other gods and absorb them into himself.

Through the machinations of two of the Julias, a boy of fourteen years, a reputed son of Caracalla, was clothed with the imperial purple. He was chosen by the soldiers for his beauty, and because he was the high priest of a Syrian solar god, El-gabal of Emesus. He assumed the name of his god, whom he brought to Rome in the form of a huge black stone. He also brought with him his oriental Court, with all its extravagant licentiousness and debauchery. In his desire to spread the worship of his own god, he trod under foot the old Roman customs, and insisted on the highest people of the State, senators and knights, dressed in proper costume, taking part in his Syrian masquerades. The upper classes were indignant, but the mass of the population and the army were too completely cosmopolitan to find fault; one god more or less did not matter, and the triumph of the Syrian god, with the brilliant ceremonies attending his worship, was popular among the Syrians, of whom there were many in all classes of society. These religious ceremonies were followed by joyous feasts and abundant largesses to the populace.

Within the temple of El-gabal were collected all the sacred emblems of the other religions, in order that the priesthood of El-gabal might concentrate in itself the mystery of every other religion. The Emperor wished his god to be recognized as the only supreme god, and therefore he sought to subordinate all other religions to that of El-gabal.

The temporary triumph of this god is a premonitory symptom of the coming official monotheism. This Emperor Elagabalus—with

all his madness and extravagance—caused *his god* to be worshipped, not himself, as most of the emperors had done; so that he started officially a kind of monotheism.

When the army wanted another emperor, the soldiers soon put Elagabalus to death. Their new favourite was Alexander Severus, who was as noble and virtuous as Elagabalus was the reverse. Both were Syrians by birth; the one was brought up for the duties of a high priest of a licentious religion, the other was educated by the best minds in Rome with a view to the imperial power. Alexander Severus was the tenderly loved son of a noble, good mother, whose one passion was devotion to her child. She loved him, blindly, shielding him from all evil and danger, with an excess of solicitude that was perhaps not the best preparation for one destined to rule a conglomerate empire. Alexander Severus was clever, cultivated, and kindly; he was democratic because of his instinctive sympathy with humanity; his manners were simple, modest, and respectful towards the senators. He gathered round him the finest and noblest minds, and was himself esteemed and loved by all because of his uprightness and the purity of his conduct. He was good to the poor; under no other ruler had works of benevolence and philanthropy been so numerous. Alexander Severus was a practical idealist, desirous of making his life conform to abstract principles of justice and kindness. But the governor of an empire threatened by barbarians from without, and at the mercy and caprice of the army within, needs some sterner qualities; he needs energy of will, assurance, and especially the talent of commanding.

These qualities Alexander Severus did not possess; his will had never been trained, for his mother had always willed for him. The soldiers, who only respected the firm hand of a strong ruler, soon found out his defect, and assassinated him and his mother, that they might place a man who could lead at their head.

Severus was a man of fine aspirations, of broad lofty views, but not made for action. He regarded his imperial power as a trust, a kind of princely office by which he was to lead men to a wider and purer piety. He allowed perfect religious liberty and encouraged all religions, believing that it mattered little how, or in what fashion, deity was worshipped, provided that worship was given.

The Christians were treated with real sympathy; they were not now a society of poor people, richer in faith than in intellectual culture; they boasted such men as Origen, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, and Cyprian. Alexander Severus allowed people to be Christians, and Christians in their own way; he sympathized with them and admired the character of Christ, but he was too universally tolerant of other religions to reject all in favour of one; as a true syncretist he could not understand the uncompromising spirit of the Christians in not yielding anything to idolators.

He wished to build a temple to Christ, but not to substitute Christianity for all the other religions.

He was too honest to be converted from reasons of policy, too sincerely syncretist to subscribe to the hostility of the Christians towards other religions; this is why he could not do the work of Constantine.

The Christians were indebted to him for the toleration he accorded them, but they perhaps owe him as much on account of the religious and moral impulse which he and his high-minded friends gave to paganism—thus preparing pagans for Christianity.

Alexander Severus frequented the temples of all the different religions, and celebrated their religious feasts; but in his private oratory, for his daily devotions, there was neither Jupiter, Serapis, Baal, nor Syrian Goddess: there were the images of his ancestors, of the best of the deified emperors, and of the most holy souls of the past; in that oratory he worshipped Apollonius of Tyana, Christ, Abraham, Orpheus, and Alexander the Great. In an adjoining oratory there were images of divine men of less perfection, among whom were Virgil and Cicero. He pondered over whatever of noble, great, or beautiful humanity had produced, and his mystical spirit found inspiration in the communion with all the great souls that he could love or venerate.

This third attempt to reform paganism also failed, because the extreme latitudinarianism of Alexander Severus prevented him from too zealously trying to propagate his own idea of worship—viz., the worship of the saints of paganism; greater concentration was needed to repel advancing Christianity.

He needed decision and energy in religion as well as in politics. Dr. Réville shows how his religion lacked consistence, how it was a combination of dissimilar elements, without any active principle of life and power to bind them together into an organic whole.

After the death of Severus people turned more and more to the beautiful ideal of Christ, who offered them a moral ideal and an incarnation of the divine.

And now we must conclude this very imperfect summary of some of the chief points handled by Dr. Réville in his interesting book. He brings clearly before us the religious situation of paganism just previous to the official advent of Christianity. He shows what men thought and felt on the eve of the greatest religious transformation the world has ever seen; he shows how, through the apparent chaos and disorder, and confused jumble of religions, divinities, philosophies, and theologies, one tendency stands out distinctly—that is, the tendency to monotheism. Paganism in all its forms seemed to be veering towards monotheism—a montheism which accommodated itself easily to the practices of polytheism, because not completely emancipated from the bonds of the old pagan nature-worship, and

which centred more and more round the worship of the sun. This tendency to solar monotheism was aided largely by the solar religions of Syria and Persia, which had been propagated in the West.

Dr. Réville shows that the ferment of religious feeling resulted in an absolutely new ideal—the ideal of holiness, purity of heart, aspiration after progress and spiritual perfection, and thirst for living communion with the gods. The human being evolved from that religious ferment had new sentiments in his heart, and new needs in his conscience; to such a being Christianity brought the completest satisfaction.

It is seldom, however, that the action of spiritual influence is absolutely one-sided. If paganism was modified by Christianity and the forces tending towards Christianity, it should not be taken for granted that Christianity was quite unaffected by its pagan surroundings. The philosophical idea of *demons* as intermediary beings, or intercessors between gods and men, was a preparation to pagans to accept Christ as a mediator between the Supreme Being and men, and, under the influence of the Neo-Platonic philosophy, a badly disguised polytheism crept into the Church, in the form of martyrs, saints, and the legions of angels and demons.

The day consecrated by pagans to the Sun was to the Christians the day of the Lord. Under Constantine, we are told, the same common prayer served the soldiers when worshipping the Sun, Mithra, Christ, or whatever gods it pleased the worshippers to regard as the supreme divinity; *but the day* was the *Dies solis*, the Sunday.

The conclusion, then, that we arrive at through the study of this period is that it was not Christianity alone, working from outside, that changed the civilized word from paganism to Christianity; but that society was transformed by the free development of living forces within itself, till, by mutual interaction, the two powers approached near enough to blend one with the other—from which blending Catholicism arose.

HOW TO NATIONALIZE THE LAND.

THE evils of landlordism are now so keenly and so universally felt, its gross injustice and the degradation of the people clearly traceable to it, so widely acknowledged, that it is needless to enlarge upon them here. The difficulty felt now is how to remedy them. No scheme has yet been put forward sufficiently simple, practicable, and free from serious objections to commend itself to general adoption. Many persons have approached the land question from the standpoint of some special class—the tenant farmer, the agricultural labourer, or the town leaseholder—and their proposals have been to take something from landlords and give it to the class favoured, without considering the interests of other classes. Their methods are therefore crude, partial, impracticable, and, if adopted, would probably produce as great evils as they are designed to remedy. The only way to look at the land question, with any chance of working out a comprehensive but simple and practical measure, is from a purely national point of view, leaving subordinate interests to adjust themselves under a perfectly free economic law. We must regard the entire population as a great co-operative company, the land as their common property or capital; and the problem is to place the land under such an administration as will best promote the interests of the whole people, and at the same time render it as easily accessible as possible to all workers on equal terms. To solve this problem, or at least, to indicate the lines on which we conceive, a solution must be sought, is the task we propose to attempt in this paper. Our measure will necessarily divide itself into two distinct parts: 1. The transfer of the land from individual to national control. 2. The work of reconstruction or organization. The former will be transitory and, once accomplished, final. The latter will be permanent, and probably more or less progressive in its character as experience may dictate.

Before sketching our Land Measure, one or two important points require careful consideration. The first is that the WHOLE OF THE LAND, and not a part only, must be brought under national administration. There are some who favour experiments in Land Nationalization, or a gradual acquisition of the land. No such partial measure could possibly be successful or advantageous. The cost of administration for a part of the land would be much greater in pro-

portion than for the whole, thus involving a pecuniary loss to the nation. Then it would be extremely inconvenient for the State and private proprietors to be in rivalry with each other. The State would be continually hampered and obstructed in carrying out needful improvements. Suppose land requires draining, and can only be drained through a neighbouring estate belonging to a private owner; blackmail would certainly be levied for permission to carry out the work. The same difficulty would arise if a road were required to give access to land surrounded by other land still in private hands. No readjustment of farms, however desirable, could take place without compensation, nor could allotments or cottages for labourers be so conveniently provided. In towns still greater inconvenience would be felt in the administration of property, especially in effecting improvements. Moreover, the land thus first and most easily acquired would be the less profitable—that which from its character or position afforded the most distant prospect of improvement in value, while the most eligible for national purposes—that in or near towns—could be acquired only at enormous expense and, in all cases, with the heavy legal expenses added. The advantages we anticipate from the resumption of the whole of the land at once would be entirely lost, inasmuch as a partial resumption could not be carried out in the same simple manner. Not only should we have to pay a high price for the land, but compensation would be demanded for the invidious distinction of depriving one landlord of his privileges and not another.

The second point is that the nation must acquire the ENTIRE INTEREST IN THE LAND. No party must have any interest in or control over it beyond what is granted by the State for industrial or residential purposes, for a limited time, and under clearly defined conditions. There must, therefore, be no such thing as a reserved tenant-right—an interest to be purchased by the incoming from the outgoing tenant. We are quite aware that on this point we tread upon the toes of some ardent land reformers, who, approaching the question exclusively from a tenant's point of view, hastily conclude that whatever does not rightfully belong to the landlord must, therefore, be the property of the tenant, unmindful that the whole people have an interest in the land. We feel sure, however that if the advocates of tenant-right will carefully consider the matter from a purely national point of view, they will see with us that no such right is admissible under a national system. Of course we admit that tenants should be fully compensated for all that they do, and, in the scheme of reconstruction here described, such compensation is secured to them. But we do not admit that the entire results of improvements belong to tenants to all eternity, for that is tantamount to ownership. When a tenant has received adequate compensation for his improvements, whatever further advantages may result are due to the land, and rightfully belong to the owner of the

land, the people. The wrong of the present system is that these advantages are intercepted from the people by a class of individuals who have no rightful claim to them. Our objections to a reserved tenant-right, or any interest for which a tenant can demand payment on giving up possession, are : (1) that it plays into the hands of capitalists. All those who are unable or unwilling to sink a portion of their capital in the purchase of a tenant-right, are excluded from all chance of occupying land, whereas our aim should be to throw the land as widely and as freely open as possible to all comers, and to afford every facility and inducement for its cultivation ; (2) Tenant-right depreciates the national interest in the land. A capitalist who has money to lay down, would say : " Well, if I could use my capital in my business I could make 10 per cent. of it ; it is, therefore, worth 10 per cent. to me, and I shall give so much less rent for the farm." A farm worth £500 a year, but encumbered with a tenant-right, for which the owner demanded £500, would thus be depreciated to a rental value of £450 ; that is, the nation would lose £50 a year for that which it could easily borrow for £15. Being confined to capitalists, the competition for such farms would be restricted, and the rents thereby further lowered ; (3) Tenant-right gives the control of the land to the tenant, and he becomes *pro tanto* an occupying owner. No one can oblige him to sell his interest till he pleases, or to any one but whom he pleases. He has virtually, therefore, not only a perpetual tenancy equivalent to ownership, but the right of nominating his successor to the exclusion of all others, and thus the land would still be a monopoly in the hands of the rich. The chances of obtaining it being so restricted, uncertain, and difficult, would discourage all but a favoured few from devoting themselves to agriculture as a means of livelihood.

A third point, second in importance only to the above, is that with agricultural land the nation must acquire and maintain the buildings and all other accessories necessary to the proper enjoyment and utilization of the land. In other cases it is not proposed that the nation should acquire or hold buildings, whether residential, manufacturing, or mercantile. But there is an important difference between agricultural buildings and other buildings, which necessitates a different treatment. In the former case the buildings are secondary to the land, and necessary for its peaceful enjoyment and utilization ; in the second case the land is secondary to the buildings, having little or no value in itself, but only as a foundation for the buildings to stand upon. The value is in the position not in the land itself. In towns a man has an ample choice. If he cannot come to terms with one house-owner, there are plenty of others ready to accommodate him, and as long as house building or house owning affords a reasonable profit, the supply will be equal to or rather above than below the demand. In the case of the agricultural tenant, however, it is

different. He has no choice, but is confined absolutely to the one house upon the farm, and if that were in the hands of a third party there would be great friction and difficulty, especially where the buildings were inadequate or inconvenient. The owner would not spend his money to accommodate the tenant, and the latter would have no alternative but to put up with things as they are, or to spend his own money in improving another man's property. For these reasons we say that it is expedient for the nation to acquire and retain the buildings and all accessories necessary for the management of agricultural land. Its interest in the land will be greatly enhanced thereby, and in no other way can its unrestricted control over the land be adequately secured. These three points being settled—viz. :—

1. That the whole of the land must be brought under national control ;

2. That that control must be unrestricted by any personal interest ; and

3. Must, in agricultural land, include buildings and all accessories,

we are prepared for the first part of our measure, which, avoiding the verbose, technical phraseology of the law, will run somewhat as follows :—

Whereas individual control over the land contravenes natural right and justice, and is detrimental to national interests, be it enacted

I. That from and after the day of 18 , all rent of land shall be due and payable to the national exchequer.

II. That on or before the day of 18 (being six months previous to the date in clause I.), all persons having any claim upon land shall send in to the Commissioners, hereinafter appointed for the purpose of carrying this Act into effect, full particulars of those claims, with all such information relating thereto as may be demanded.

III. That on or before the same date the overseers in each parish be required to send in a complete list of all persons occupying land within the parish, with such particulars of each holding as the Commissioners shall require.

From the former of these returns will be compiled a complete register of proprietors ; from the latter a complete register of tenants. There would be no need of any legal investigation of title, except in the case of double or disputed claims. Every proprietor would have to produce a title or his claim would not be admitted. The title produced would be accepted unless there was any reason to suspect its genuineness. Every claimant, at his own cost, would have to

satisfy the Commissioners on this head. The two registers would check and verify each other. Discrepancies, if any, would have to be cleared up by the parties concerned. In the case of agricultural holdings, the gross rental paid by the tenant would be taken by the State. Where such holdings are in the hands of proprietors, the rent would be assessed on the same scale as similar adjacent holdings. In the case of residential and town holdings, the gross rental being determined, a reasonable percentage on the value of the buildings, which would remain the property of the present owners, would be deducted, and the balance, being the rental value of the land or site, would be payable to the State by the owner of the buildings, who would receive his share of the compensation awarded. From the above returns the entire gross land rental of the country would be ascertained. From this such a percentage as may be sanctioned by Parliament (say 20 per cent.) would be deducted for costs of management, losses, and other contingencies, and annuities payable from the land revenue of the country to the amount of the balance, not exceeding the net income now derived from land, would be secured to proprietors.

With the completion of the registers and the allotment of the annuities, the work of transition would be complete. The land would be under the direct and unrestricted control of the nation. The people, through their representatives in Parliament, would determine the form of its future administration, and appoint their own responsible agents to carry their wishes into effect. All this would be accomplished without any social or monetary disturbance. Not a tenant would be disturbed till the natural or legal expiration of his tenancy. Not a shilling would be required from the people for the purpose of compensation. The revenue from the land, over £100,000,000 per annum, would fully provide for the annuities, about £80,000,000, and leave a balance of £20,000,000 per annum in the national exchequer for the benefit of the people. In addition to this sum, there would be a great saving on mortgages, which we propose to treat in this manner. Mortgagees are entitled to the capital sum advanced, but this need not be paid in gold or bank notes. It may be paid in the shape of annuities at the market price of the day, with advantage to the mortgagees themselves, who would thus be provided, free of charge, with a security of the highest character, which they may retain as long or sell as soon as they please. Now the present amount of mortgage on English landed property is estimated at about £240,000,000. On this 4, sometimes $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. is paid, while the nation can borrow at less than 3. By paying off mortgages by annuities as above proposed, therefore, a saving of over 1 per cent. can be effected: $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on the above amount will yield £3,000,000 per annum. Add to this the annual increment in the value of the

land, say £2,000,000, and we have another £5,000,000 to the national good. This £5,000,000, with very moderate fees charged for transactions in the land department, would amply suffice for all the costs of administration, leaving the £20,000,000 above-mentioned available for the immediate reduction of taxation. Some persons would devote the whole, or at least a portion of this surplus, to the redemption of the annuities. This would benefit future generations at the expense of the present. We think the present has borne its burdens long enough, and first deserves consideration. We propose, therefore, to provide for the gradual reduction and ultimate extinction of the annuities in another way, and to devote the entire surplus to the immediate removal of burdens from the people: £20,000,000 a year—one-fourth of the imperial taxation—removed from the shoulders of the people, could not fail to give an immense impetus to industry of all kinds. Agriculture might again lift up its head, manufacturers would be able to compete successfully with foreign nations, trade would revive, while the land, being free, could be placed at the disposal of the people in such a manner as to afford healthy and profitable employment for every man not otherwise engaged. This increase of industry would react upon the land so that the annual increment would not only be maintained, but probably increased.

With such a substantial advantage as the above, we need be under no very great concern for the extinction of the annuities. Still, provision should be made to this end, and we venture to suggest the following method, which, with something of novelty about it, will be the least inconvenient to landlords, while it will secure to the nation a certain and annually increasing advantage till the last penny is paid. In the great reduction of taxation which would ensue on the change in our land system, landlords would very largely participate, and it is not unreasonable to require them to surrender something in return. Our proposal is, that annuities, not exceeding the net annual income derived from the land, should be assigned to landlords in the form of a 3 per cent. stock, but subject to an annual diminution of 3*d.* per cent of stock. That is, for the first year the dividend shall be £3 per cent. of stock; for the second year, £2 1*s.* 9*d.*; for the third year, £2 1*s.* 6*d.*, and so on, diminishing 3*d.* annually till the last 3*d.* is paid, when it will cease altogether. Suppose the annual amount payable to landlords should prove to be £84,000,000, the annual reduction would be £350,000. The national income would benefit by this amount, to which add a very moderate increment in the value of land of £1,650,000 and we have, besides the £20,000,000 mentioned above, a further surplus of £2,000,000 per annum available for the further continuous reduction of taxation. This strictly applied would extinguish the whole of our Imperial taxation in about thirty years. Applied next to the relief of local burdens, this con-

tinued surplus would gradually diminish, and in another twenty years or so entirely extinguish all local taxation. Thus, in half a century, the entire burden of both Imperial and local taxation might be removed, to the great relief of the industrial classes, not by any sudden convulsion, but by a gradual process, the full benefit of which would be felt yearly. Henceforth the annual revenue of the land would suffice for all national requirements. After this the annually increasing surplus would be available for educational and other national purposes, for further developing the resources of the country and improving the condition of the people, and ultimately for a national assurance fund for the relief of old age and infirmity.

Let us compare this mode of liquidation by annually diminishing annuities with other methods which have been proposed. 1. Life annuities. The great objection to these is that from the uncertainty of individual life they are wholly unnegotiable, and can be appraised only on a very large scale on the principle of life assurance. 2. Annuities for terms of years. These are easily valued and are therefore negotiable at any time, but the objection to them is that they afford no relief to the nation till they expire. The burden upon the people remains the same till the last dividend is paid, when a huge windfall drops into the lap of a future generation, which has borne no share of the burden. 3. Perpetual annuities. The present writer has hitherto advocated this form of payment as preferable to those above mentioned on the ground that it entails a lighter immediate burden, and therefore affords some relief from the first, which may be increased annually by redemption of the bonds at par or by purchase in the open market. The latter has a tendency to raise unduly the price of the stock to the nation's disadvantage, while the former involves the necessity of some mode of selection introducing an element of chance, and tending to depress the value of the security. The diminishing annuities suggested above are free from these objections. There is no uncertainty about them as with life annuities; they are as easily valued as annuities for a term of years; there is not the trouble, expense, or uncertainty of purchase, while they afford an immediate and annually increasing relief to the people; being spread over a long period, no great inconvenience would be felt by the holders. It may be objected by holders that in this kind of stock their capital would be wearing out and finally exhausted. This is equally true of every terminable security, but can easily be provided for by reinvesting out of each annual dividend so much as will produce the amount of decrement. If we start with a 3 per cent. stock diminishing 3*d.* annually, it would be necessary to re-invest about 8*s.* out of every £3 in any similar stock. This would reduce the available dividend to £2 12*s.*, and the annuities would be equivalent in value to a perpetual stock at that rate. In further compensation,

anticipating the abolition of taxation, these annuities, from the beginning, might be made exempt from income-tax and succession duty, which would probably add some 2s. to their annual value. Bankers and financiers may object that such annuities would be less available as securities for advances, but the objection is not greater in these than in any other terminable security. Their value can be easily ascertained at any time; a table might be made showing their value, at a given rate of money, for every year of their continuance. Further, it should be remembered that the nation was not made for bankers and financiers, and the latter must, therefore, learn to adapt themselves to whatever is advantageous to the former.

In the land thus taken over by the nation would, of course, be included that held by railway and other companies. As there might be some difficulty in putting a value upon this land, and as there is a widespread and growing impression that the railways, which have become the highways of the nation, should be under national rather than private control, it would be a favourable opportunity for the nation to exercise its right and take over the entire railway interest. This would be attended by great advantages to the community at large. There would be a great saving in the expenses of administration. The numerous boards of directors and highly paid officials would be replaced by a central department, similar to the Post Office. A considerable reduction of rates, both for goods and passengers, could be effected, while the vexatious delays and inconveniences too often experienced in passing from one company's lines to those of another could be easily removed, and both passengers and goods could pass from any one point to any other as easily as a letter or a post-parcel does now. The present proprietors would, of course, be paid in a stock, bearing a fixed interest equivalent in value.

Thus we have endeavoured to show that the difficulties in the way of an equitable scheme of Land Nationalization are not insuperable, nor so great as many imagine. The advantages to be gained will depend upon the mode of administration to be set up, the importance of which cannot be over-estimated. Space will not permit us on the present occasion to develop this, the second part of our scheme, but we hope to return to the subject at an early opportunity.

WOMEN IN PUBLIC LIFE.

TWENTY years ago John Stuart Mill laid down "that the principle which regulates the existing social relations between the two sexes—the legal subordination of one sex to the other—is wrong in itself, and one of the chief hindrances to human improvement, and that it ought to be replaced by a principle of perfect equality, admitting no power or privilege on the one side, nor disability on the other."

Since those words were penned the relations of the sexes have been vastly improved. The law has recognized a married woman's exclusive right to property acquired or money earned by herself, and she can either sue or be sued in her own name. Thus, to some extent, the legal disabilities of women have been removed and their natural rights recognized. But the era of equality to which Mill looked forward has not yet arrived.

Indeed, the ancient prejudices, which for centuries have rendered women political nonentities, are almost as strong and as virulent as ever. The proposal to confer the franchise on female taxpayers has been fiercely opposed in some quarters, and one distinguished woman, Mrs. Lynn Lynton, has quite recently issued a violent protest against any alteration in the law whereby any class of women might be enabled to vote at a Parliamentary election. The arguments relied on by those who object to the admission of one-half of the population to political privileges are of an entirely sentimental character. According to Mrs. Lynn Lynton, "our grand old flag" would be in imminent danger of being torn to shreds if her own sex were allowed to vote. Can anything be more absurd?

How could it injure the British navy to confer the franchise on women? It might, perhaps, be contended that female electors would prefer peace to war. No doubt, they would; and herein they would be exhibiting a truly rational and philanthropic spirit; for a peaceful policy is quite consistent with national security.

Some timid male opponents of the extension of female liberty are accustomed to dwell, in a "forcible-feeble" style, on the possibility of making women coarse and aggressive by thrusting them into the struggles of public life. It is, however, an entire mistake to assume that ladies who devote their time to matters intimately connected with the public welfare are either in mind or in manners inferior to those who either give themselves up entirely to domestic

affairs, or lead insipid lives, in which gossip, novel-reading, and amateur musical performances form the principal ingredients.

The world's greatest women have been enthusiastic lovers of liberty; and even a superficial study of history will show that progress owes much to the efforts and the sacrifices of heroines who readily gave up their lives in the cause of humanity. Joan of Arc, Catherine of Siena, Elizabeth of Hungary, Charlotte Corday, and hundreds of others have earned immortality by brave deeds, from which the majority of "the sterner sex" would probably shrink. In our time there have been women in whom the burning love of their fellow-creatures has been far stronger than any other instinct. Surely no male philanthropist has left a nobler record than Mrs. Fry or Miss Florence Nightingale?

How can active benevolence make people unrefined? In its best form, political life really does mean active benevolence; and the notion that by taking part in it ladies would lose their native delicacy is utterly unreasonable, and in direct contradiction to the teachings of experience.

Of course it is quite possible that some women may be induced to speak on public platforms, and to enter on electioneering contests, through mere love of notoriety; but do not men frequently exhibit this species of vanity? and is any one so silly as to suggest that, because there are some vain and self-seeking politicians, no honest man should have anything to do with politics? The majority of well-educated women secretly yearn for some sphere in which they can make themselves useful to the community at large. It is a gross error to suppose that the thirst for distinction and the desire to gain popularity by improving the condition of the masses are feelings entirely confined to men. Mrs. Lynn Lynton appears to imagine that a woman's ambition should be entirely centred in the success of her father, her brother, or her husband. But there are thousands of women to whom this kind of reflected glory would be wholly unsatisfying. Besides, is there any rational ground for compelling women to remain passive, when their hearts are filled with passionate longing to play a part in the great drama of legislation? Even the most unintelligent man is entitled to vote, if he can show the qualification required by the Franchise Acts; and this simple privilege is denied to the most highly endowed woman, no matter how deeply she may be interested in political questions.

It is idle to say that the interests of the female sex are quite safe in the hands of men. Even if this were so, the necessity for direct representation would not be obviated. Too long has one portion of the human race been treated like children. In Oriental countries women are still nothing better than domestic slaves; and their bondage is not rendered one jot less ignoble by the fact that they are sometimes confined in gilded cages. The Harem is the symbol of female

servitude; and, if we have advanced a step or two in civilization beyond the system which prevails in Turkey and elsewhere, our marriage laws are still based on the idea of inequality, and we tacitly encourage prostitution as an indirect preservative of our domestic purity. Are we to assume that, if there were women in Parliament, some attempt would not be made to remove or, at any rate, to readjust what is called "the social evil"? Is any man so blindly apathetic as to believe that his wife, his sister, and his mother care nothing about the miseries of those whom seduction has driven to a life of shame? At present, such matters are allowed to "rest," because men either regard the mischief as incurable, or treat its existence with that indifference which is the fruit of long-established custom.

It is plain that there are still grievances which concern women much more deeply than men. The time for dealing with the so-called weaker sex, as if its members had no reasoning faculties, and no sense of moral responsibility, is long gone by. Why, then, should we exclude women from public life? If politics, both in England and in America, have become unfortunately associated with corruption, the admission of women into the political arena would, no doubt, have a purifying influence on the conduct of public affairs. The sympathetic nature of woman would be sure to impart a vital warmth and earnestness into Parliamentary discussions. Politics would cease to be guided by the cold principle of expediency; and the keen observation and quick impulses of the one sex would stimulate and strengthen the mental grasp and speculative power of the other. If it be true that woman is the complement of man, he requires her aid in public as well as in private affairs. The united efforts of the two sexes would certainly render political work more effective than it is at present. By the intensity of her emotions and the clearness of her insight, woman is able to divine many things that escape the slow-paced logic of the other sex. It has been pointed out by Mill that, "with equality of experience and of general faculties, a woman sees much more than a man of what is immediately before her." Men are more prone to generalize upon every subject than women, and the result is that they frequently form very erroneous impressions as to the actual facts of life. In dealing with minute details, a man may often be deceived, where a woman's clear perceptions take in everything. The intellectual co-operation of the male and female intellect would, therefore, be productive of the most admirable results.

Religion has been often invoked in support of the theory that women were intended by the Creator to be subject to men. A false, and certainly an ignoble, interpretation has been given to certain passages in the Bible, in order to prove that the equality of the sexes is opposed to the Divine command. Those who have recourse

to such a contemptible expedient, show themselves to be utterly incapable of understanding either the philosophy of history or the philosophy of religion. Slavery was not only tolerated but approved of when the Christian Church was in its infancy; but can any enlightened clergyman venture to justify slavery in the nineteenth century? No doubt, the Church could not fairly be held responsible for all the degrading institutions in the midst of which it has developed; but, if it sought to restore base institutions, after they had been destroyed, its action would be little less than criminal. The enslavement of woman, either under the form of marriage, or in any other way, is quite as odious, though perhaps not quite as obvious, as that of the black man by the white.

In ancient Rome the degradation of a system which gave a husband the power of life and death, not only over his children, but also over his wife, was felt at a comparatively early period, and a certain amount of freedom was conferred upon married women. According to the proud maxim of the Republic a legal union could only be contracted by free citizens, and so it was that the condition of a woman of servile extraction, living with a free-born Roman, was one of concubinage, and not of marriage. But, as Gibbon observes, "her modest station, below the honours of a wife, above the infamy of a prostitute, was acknowledged and approved by the laws. The celebration of her nuptials with the partner of her bed would legitimize her children."

There was here a sentiment of justice which even the hateful institution of slavery failed to stifle. In many respects the Roman law as to concubinage bears favourable comparison with the cruel English law of bastardy.

Let us, then, boldly face the question—Must women be treated as the equals or as the inferiors of men? If they are below the level of men, how are we to determine the extent of their inferiority? Within the brief period during which they have enjoyed the reasonable use of their intellectual faculties women have, it must be admitted, made remarkable progress. They have shown considerable proficiency, not only in literature, but in the most severe branches of science. Two gifted Englishwomen of this century have exhibited consummate genius in two entirely different spheres. Harriet Martineau, with her solidity of mind, her grasp of economical principles, and her rare intellectual courage, may fairly take rank amongst some of her most distinguished male contemporaries; and George Eliot, if not the greatest, is certainly one of the greatest of English novelists. No intelligent observer can fail to note the enormous amount of mental activity displayed by women in our own time. The number of earnest and able female workers in the various departments of science and literature is every day increasing.

Some old-fashioned persons, who cling to the idea that publicity

destroys the essential charm of womanhood, say: "Let them write books if they choose, but let them keep off the platform!" But what if a woman is better fitted for the work of a politician than for that of an author? Many men make excellent members of Parliament who could not attempt to write a novel or a play; and, in like manner, many women possess administrative capacity who have no literary talents. Why not apply the same rule to both sexes? Is woman to be banished from public life merely on account of her sex? If it can be shown that, by devoting her attention to politics, she neglects any paramount duty, then the objection to her action becomes reasonable; but not till then.

It is true that the majority of married women at present occupy most of their time with household affairs; but they have many spare hours, which might be given up to something more useful than drawing-room tittle-tattle or the perusal of very silly novels. Moreover, there are many women who are either childless or unmarried; and for these public life would supply a splendid means of, at the same time, enlarging their minds and promoting social progress.

Let the experiment be tried! Give women votes! Let them be qualified to offer themselves, if they please, as candidates for seats in Parliament. If they are as incompetent for political work as they are sometimes declared to be, their failure will be a source of triumph to those who hold that women should be always kept in leading-strings. But if, on the other hand, it should be found that there is in the sex the material for great orators, great leaders, and great reformers, the parrot cry as to the inferiority of women to men will be effectually silenced.

D. F. HANNIGAN.

No question, perhaps, has been more persistently misunderstood, and therefore misrepresented, than the question of Women's Suffrage. To mention it to some people is like flaunting a red rag in the face of a bull; to bring it before others is at once to provoke ridicule. Now, why indignation? and why ridicule? Simply because the subject is not understood.

In the imaginations of some good folk, to give the suffrage to women is to give it to all women, is to make them platform orators, is to send them wholesale into Parliament, is to take them out of their "sphere" (whatever that may mean), and, in short, is to leave every household buttonless and puddingless, and to overturn the British Constitution.

When the question first came up there was a great outcry:—

"If you give *married* women votes, you will set husband and wife against each other and so destroy the peace of home!"

In vain did the advocates of Women's Suffrage explain that votes

were not to be given to married women. The frightened public only shut its ears and shrieked the harder. After some years the truth was at last dinned into opposing brains that only spinster-householders and widow-householders were claiming the franchise; and now what do you think the outcry is? You will hardly believe it. They now declare with solemnity that they cannot permit the franchise to be given to women—because married women are to be excluded! You will hear a chorus if you care to listen:

“It is so unfair to the married women! It is so hard on the married women! We cannot in conscience vote for a measure which will enfranchise only a portion of the community!”

They have forgotten what they said twenty years ago.

But now, at last, we can agree with them. It is hard, it is unfair to the married women—that is, to the married women who have property of their own. Things have changed since the first Women’s Suffrage Bill was drafted. A married woman can now hold property, and she has a right to her own earnings. Since the law has done this for her she is in a new position, and now she may go further and say:—

“Why should I be punished for being married? If I had remained single, or if I should become a widow, many a man would believe it right for me to have a vote, and yet I should not then be better qualified to vote than I am at present. My property (whether house, or business, or shop, or landed estate) is in my own hands. I alone pay its rates and taxes. My husband has a separate business (or separate property), and he pays separate rates and taxes. The only difference between us is that he has a vote and I have none. Is this fair?”

The professed rule of this country is that representation shall be based upon taxation. We are fond of saying, “No taxation without representation.” And we take it for granted, in common talk, that all householders who pay rates and taxes are entitled to a voice in the disposal of their contributions. The fact is that every householder pays rates and taxes, but only the male householder has the privilege of voting at a parliamentary election.

The injustice of this comes out pretty strongly in the case of a bribery petition. The tax is laid upon every householder in the guilty town, whether that householder be man or woman; and thus the women citizens are punished for what they never did and could not do. Many indignant remonstrances have come up from householders thus treated, but the Government has always declared that redress was impossible.

If you come to think of it, it was the denial of this same principle of the inseparableness of Taxation and Representation which lost us our American colonies. That was injustice writ large. He that ran might read. But when it comes to a case of taxation

without representation inside our own island, oh, that is a very different matter.

It is well to remember that there was a time when ratepaying women had no voice in municipal elections. They have been enfranchised in this respect within the last few years. They also possess the right to vote for school-boards, and have possessed it ever since school-boards began to be. Then they are allowed to elect poor-law guardians; and, quite lately, a fourth vote has been put into their hands, and they may now send representatives to county councils. Four votes granted, but the fifth is still too sacred for female use!

Now, have the households of these voting women been worse managed in consequence of their taking a little interest in things outside their homes? has the darning of stockings gone out of fashion? and is Society overturned to its foundations?

And yet all these elections come round more frequently than a parliamentary election does. True, there may be a bye-election, but it is possible for a general election to be needed only once in every seven years. It therefore does not call for public service on the part of a voter so often as another kind of election. If the spinsters and widows who are heads of houses can find time to choose people to represent them on county councils, town councils, school-boards, and poor-law boards, can they not much more easily manage the choice of a member of Parliament?

A word to the small body of men that resolutely oppose Women's Suffrage. You think, do you, that women in general would lose their heads if once in every few years the householders among them went up to the polling-booths and recorded their votes? I would ask in return: Do you all lose your heads when the householders among you record their votes for their Parliamentary representatives? Is your business worse done because you have a voice in Imperial matters? Are your shops and offices neglected because once in every few years you go and drop a paper into a ballot-box? And, further, because you are a recognized member of a great nation, is your whole time given to the duties and privileges of citizenship? Does the work of parliamentary elections so absorb you that neither home nor business nor society has the advantage of your inestimable attention?

Every fresh Reform Bill has caused great searchings of heart, and there have always been timid folk who have dreaded each extension of the franchise and have prophesied revolutionary disasters. The arguments used have always been of the same complexion, and they are being used to-day against the enfranchisement of women taxpayers.

One argument was and is this: that the unenfranchised don't

want their rights; another, that, though they certainly want them, they have no business to want them and must not receive any attention whatever; another, that they have no wrongs; and a fourth, that, though they undoubtedly have wrongs, they are not competent to offer any opinion upon them, but may rest assured that they shall be tenderly cared for in the future as they always have been in the past.

These arguments have somehow never managed to satisfy the desires of any of the unenfranchised out in the cold; and they do not satisfy the women of to-day.

ELIZABETH MARTYN.

THE RUSSIAN PEASANTRY.¹

THESE volumes discourse primarily and mainly of the Russian *moujik* or peasant, his qualities, aptitudes, and history; next, of the *mir*, or village commune, and territorial socialistic autonomy; and also of the *artel*, or system of industrial and trade combinations which pervades all Russia. Stepniak explains the results of emancipation, and its unfair distribution of land. A peasant family of seven or eight can, under the Russian climate and system, cultivate fifty-four acres, but emancipation allotted only about a fourth of this, the taxes being relatively heavier. Less than one-third (27 per cent.) of the cultivatable land was thus made over to the peasantry, who sit on what they call their "cat's plots," whilst enormous tracts lie waste around them. This deficiency of land has ever since been the Russian peasant's destiny or fate, and Stepniak next shows how the devil was introduced into the emancipation paradise in the shape of the *koulak*, the village usurer, and "*mir*-eater," and in effect man-eater; how the ruinous system of the *kabala*, or bondage culture, became the only one possible on the bloated estates of the landlords, destroying a hundred times more wealth than it created. He traces the economic decomposition of the *mir*, and the degradation of the *moujik* in mind and morals, verging in many cases on, and tending almost to, desperation, and the political prostitution of the *mir*, by substituting Government creatures, or *tchnovniks*, for elected village elders, and for the ten elected judges of the *volost* (an administrative unit of several villages). All this has reduced one-third of the peasants to the position of *batraks*, or landless wage-seekers, whilst the cultivated land of European Russia is only 21 per cent., against 61 per cent. in Great Britain, and 83 in France. Stepniak declares that the decrepit autocracy of Russia is totally unequal to the situation which it has in fact created, and which is extremely critical, and he therefore hopes for a change of Government to be brought about by the aggravated evils of the present system, as well as by those intellectual and moral forces which are being engendered by education and religion, and which are the motive power of revolutions, as want of bread is their immediate occasion. Such are the

¹ *The Russian Peasantry: their Agrarian Condition, Social Life, and Religion.* By Stepniak, Author of *The Russian Storm Cloud*, *Russia under the Tsars*, and *Underground Russia*. In two vols. Sonnenschein, 1888.

causes which Stepniak believes will, when all is known, act with a terribly explosive and disillusioning energy on the trustful but strong nature of the *moujik*.

The problem is momentous and far-reaching, whether as regards Russian internal social, agrarian, religious, political, or communal developments, the relations between Russians and British, henceforth to be neighbours, and we hope friends, throughout so large a portion of the earth's surface, and the comparisons which cannot but be instituted between the Russian peasantry and those German populations with which they may come into collision.

The chaotic arrangement of these two volumes is partly explained by the fact that one-third had been previously published, and so we have stated above rather the order in which the subjects ought to have been treated, than that in which they appear. The books impress us with the author's complete comprehension of his subject and thorough knowledge of its details, with his genuine sympathy for the actors in this tragedy of Russian history and this history of the Russian tragedy, and with his strong determination, as far as depends on one man, to advance that which he considers the inevitable issue—a national communal land system and co-operation.

One of the results of a right understanding of the Russia *moujik's* real character will undoubtedly be to lead the English Government and people to reverse the policy hitherto pursued towards Russia. Whether in politics or trade there is hardly an interest or an object for which we might not advantageously combine.

Russia, says Stepniak, has luminous ideals of the future, springing from her collective aspirations. Taking into account the present economical ideas, the training and moral habits of the rural classes, and the intellectual and moral dispositions of their educated brethren, her economical evolution may now be very rapid, and of all European nations the Russians have the best chance of realizing on a national, nay, an Imperial scale, the uses of co-operation or socialism, and of thus exerting with their vast territory and population an incalculable effect upon the world's progress. The abstract sciences only, he says, are cosmopolitan, but all other things that have to do with living men become great only on condition of first becoming national. The Russian industrial masses are methodical, laborious, conscientious, and loving; but their governors block the way. Russian art has, on the contrary, already attained a glorious height, for it has been the only domain in which the genius of her individual creators has, unchecked and unobstructed, been inspired and supported by the genius of the people, and it is already becoming an international inheritance. In other directions also Russia is powerfully propagandist and sympathetic. This book is, therefore, an indictment of the Imperial

Government of all the Russias, to which it attributes the misery of the peasants—that is to say, of the nation; the failure of emancipation to emancipate, and the divorcement of the nation from the land. It explains how—tender, true, and grand as is the *moujik*—the police and other vermin prey upon him unhindered; how the press is gagged under pretence of sedition, and the Bible was tabooed as revolutionary; how the old world communal arrangements are destroyed, and how the death-rate, even in villages and in the open country, is not only abnormal but enormous; how the export of corn increased till the further starvation of the peasant became unsafe; how individualism and weekly wages and the proletariat are taking the place of the small communal owner; and how, if Russia would be prosperous, she must first be free. If Russia cannot have a Tzar-democrat, and is not to have the revolution, she must have the land, cheap credit, and education at a very early date.

Until lately Russian peasants were all landowners, although serfs, and no occupation is so fitted to develop a morally and physically healthy race as genuine husbandry where the tiller is also the owner. The cares and poetry of agricultural work and life have kept the Russian peasants pure through three centuries of slavery, and local self-government in the village council has educated them. As members of their local communes they have, from time immemorial, managed the land, the forests, the fisheries, and the renting of public dwellings; distributed the commune's share of taxes, elected the rural executive administration and the ten peasant judges of the *volost*. They believe that the only rightful claim to property is given by work, and that women have equal rights with men. The *mir* settled questions of divorce, and as late as the sixteenth century elected the parson, as dissenting villages still do, the bishop taking the *mir's* nominees. Whole villages may be, and often are, converted in a lump, by vote of the *mir*. Near Riazan, a peasant explained to Stepniak how they withstood the *pop* of their village. "Take care, *balka* (father)," said they, "or we will give up orthodoxy, and the *mir* will elect a new *pop* from among ourselves." For centuries the *mir* maintained and improved the old Russian principle of governing without oppression, by unanimous vote (not a mere majority), and by a high development of the principles of justice, equality, and conciliation. "Each for himself, but God and the *mir* for all," is their motto; and the *mir's* wider morality has tempered and softened that of the individual. No people treat aliens so kindly. During the last Turkish war, while town shopboys and burghers cast dirt at Turkish prisoners, the *moujiks* offered them bread and coppers. With the *mir* the law is nowhere, the conscience everywhere. It is repugnant to them to use a dead legal abstraction to the injury of a living man and neighbour, and whereas the upper classes are careful and hesitate when discussing, the *moujik*

fears nothing. "What struck me most," says Engelhardt, "was the freedom of speech. The *moujik* discusses before the whole village all kinds of political and social questions; a *moujik* who has paid his taxes to Tzar and landlord fears nobody. He may stand bareheaded before you, but you feel you have to do with an independent, plain-spoken man, not at all inclined to be obsequious, or to take his tone from you. Look how the *moujik* behaves to criminals. He calls and treats them as 'unhappy,' and shows no contempt in meeting a body of convicts escorted to Siberia. Self-restraint and suffering for the *mir* was the form of heroism to which an enthusiastic peasant aspired, for the *mir* had no trace of hierarchy or distinction of ranks, confiding in the good faith of the people and in the collective conscience and wisdom. Count Leo Tolstoi refers the educated classes to the Gospel as it is understood by the *moujik*. The orthodox Church has no hold on the masses. The *pop*, or priest, is but an official of the bureaucracy and a depredator of the commune, whereas the popular type of a saint is 'a man of the *mir*,' a man of practical piety, and a benefactor of the people."

"The mighty figure of the hero of the plough," says Stepniak, "has lost nothing by being stripped of tinsel. Hewn in unpolished stone, he looks better than when robed in marble. The charm of his strength, dauntless courage, and moral character is heightened by pity for the overwhelming sufferings of this childlike giant." The Russians are patriots, but they believe in the people rather than in the State, and all that irresistible idealism which stimulates to great labour and sacrifice is with them democratic. The crimes of the State against the people prevent the union of the two in Russian aspirations; and not the least of these crimes was the gradual transformation, from 1868 to 1874, of the self-governing *mir*, which towards the latter date passed under the absolute control of the *ispravnik*, or superintendent of the rural police. These creatures of autocracy have transformed the elected officers of the rural government, the elders, into their own creatures, more dependent even than the soldiers of the police stations!

The land is the object of the peasant's day-dreams and longings, as well as of a touching, almost filial, respect and devotion. In the peasants' songs and ordinary speech the usual epithet applied to it is "mother," or "little mother." The whole tenor of his life suggests the idea that the chief aim of existence is to serve the land, and not to use it. A *moujik* will survey with complacency the furrow the plough, and his faithful friend his horse, have traced. At the sight of a golden corn-field his heart will be filled with exultant joy. He delights in the powerful exertion of mowing. What he prizes is the mode of life which the possession of land allows him to live, and which blends into one inseparable whole the work and the companions of work; and a Russian *moujik* probably

feels more grieved and downhearted at separation from his furrow than almost any other husbandman.

This union between the man and the soil has nothing compulsory in it, but is free and pure, because of the unmixed and evident good the land is bestowing on the man, for which good the man feels that he must repay the land—his benefactress—with care and labour. Through all the changes of the year the man and the land are almost living as parts of the same whole; and with these fruitful ideas of free, unconstrained union, based on the conviction that good must be earned by good, what a high moral standard, what pure conscientious principles might have formed the base of the whole existence of family, commune, or nation! There are, however, two other things which modify the *moujik's* passion for the soil—his perfect abhorrence of private property in land, and the peculiar arrangements of the *mir*. No single strip of land can the peasant call his own save that whercon his house stands. To-day he holds one piece, to-morrow the *mir* votes, according to the number of his family, a redistribution which may be larger or smaller, better or worse. Families never get their allotment in one block, but in a number of strips, and they prefer this, for it allows perfect fairness as to soil, position, water, &c.

"The *moujik* is, as a rule," says our author, "unconcerned for what is called comfort, and considers indifference to hardship as an attribute of man. If you enter the house of a rich peasant, whose granary is full of corn, whose stables hold half a dozen horses, and who probably has somewhere under the floor a jugful of bright silver roubles, you will be surprised at the extreme simplicity of the household arrangements. The big unpolished table occupies the place of honour under the *ikons* or images of saints, and wooden trenches some two feet deep run along the walls for seats in the day and for bedsteads at night. The coat acts as a blanket, and beds are hardly known, even at peasants' hotels, where a plentiful table is kept; and in the winter the large top of the stone oven is the favourite sleeping-place, and generally reserved for the elders to keep their old bones warm. All the peasants dress in much the same simple manner; no under-garment, a shirt of homespun, if of red fustian it is very much appreciated, and light cotton or linen trousers. The richest wear boots. The 'bast' shoes are in common use, but in winter a kind of home-made woollen boot is preferred, and the long woollen homespun coat is replaced by a sheepskin overcoat, by rich and poor alike. Both men and women, as a rule, keep their bodies very clean. Every family not totally destitute has its hot steam bath, where all wash on the eve of every holiday. The poorer use the family oven, getting into it just after the removal of the coal, which is a real martyrdom. As to food, well-to-do families eat whole-meal bread and gruel, and meat on Sundays,

and only occasionally on a week-day. Migrations are never made only by families, but are considerable enough to form a new *mir*; and of the many thousands of peasants compelled to abandon the plough for a time, nine out of ten return to their village hardships."

Of these husbandmen, Uspensky's sketch of Ivan Afanasieff, the tragedy of whose life consists in being constantly obliged to leave the land, to which he always returns, is a genuine example. "However exhausted and toil-worn, the life in 'his country,' and the return to the 'peasant state' and to agricultural labour, speedily wipe out all traces of illness, sorrow, and indignation from his face, which once more looks calm, noble, benevolent."¹ Stepniak declares that the *moujiks* possess in a high degree one qualification which in all countries has constituted the very essence of human dignity—they are truthful. There is neither falsehood nor deceit in their lives. In their families and in all their mutual relations everything is clear, genuine, frank, even as to egotism and oppression. "Millions of our people," says Stepniak, "have lived from generation to generation without knowing or suffering a lie." We wish we could believe this expression of enthusiastic patriotism to be literally true!

The peasant fights for his land as soldiers in a battle, and whilst all of them may be said to have saved their honour, only about two-thirds have preserved their land, twisting themselves with miraculous dexterity out of the usurer's clutches and from under the tax-collector's hammer. But what a fight it is that Stepniak narrates:—

"The peasants when ploughing 'at their leisure,' because this is not pressing work, rise before the sun, and do not go to rest until it is dark. As to harvest-time, it is not without cause called *strada*, or sufferance. When mowing the hay (on their own land, of course) the peasants do not allow themselves more than six hours' rest out of the twenty-four. Towards the close of the harvest season the peasant gets thin, and his face grows dark and emaciated, and he will in his secret heart pray to God for rain that he may have a day of rest. In fine weather, however weary, he will never desist. The ordinary villager, eight months out of twelve, eats bread mixed with husks, pounded straw, or birch bark. It is when reduced to such extremities as these that the peasant applies to the usurer. His children cry for bread, and, said one, they are not like cattle, and he then steps on the slippery declivity at the foot of which yawns the abyss of misery summed up in the word '*batrak*.' A whole third of our peasantry has slipped down this descent since 1861, and is now at the bottom."² There are now 20,000,000, there, and among the remaining 40,000,000, others will join the ranks of

¹ Uspensky, vol. vi.

² Speech of chairman at St. Petersburg Congress of Russian Farmers, March 4, 1886.

the ruined to-morrow, if not to-day. What makes them struggle on is, that when the household numbers several workmen all may be well again, and they may become 'real *moujiks*' once more. Large families and rich families are synonymous terms, and labour used to be a certain source of prosperity, independence, self-respect, and consideration."

"God," say our people, "loves labour;" when, however, labour lost the power to secure from want it lost much of its dignity, scope, and attractiveness. The peasant also wants to feel free from flogging. The *koulak* or *mir*-eating usurer's motto is "only fools work," and the greed for money is becoming universal. Since the peasant has had to go wage-hunting, the vigour of the big patriarchal families is sapped by the lowest instincts as well as by the loftiest aspirations developed by modern times. The *mir* as a whole plays an all-important part in the cycle of agricultural life, as guardian of the land, meadows, and forests, controlling their fair distribution, and directing the common work; but when money-making in towns, each depends on himself, and rather begrudges contributions to his family in the village and the *mir*. "Near is my coat, but nearer is my skin." Not to suffer hunger is the *beau-ideal* of the grey *moujik*.

Thus Russia is essentially a peasant State: her agricultural population constitutes 82 per cent. of the entire population, a proportion approached only by Ireland, with 73 per cent. The agrarian question is therefore her national question, and the *moujik* the chief figure and factor of her social and political life. The Russian peasant until lately believed in the Tzar, and still believes in the *mir*, which has developed in him so many excellent qualities; and in religion he is a mixture of superstition, enthusiasm, and clear-headedness. For trifles—a letter less in the name "Jsus," a finger more in the sign of the cross—thousands of Russian men, women, and girls formerly encountered death on the scaffold or at the stake—have undergone the horrible tortures of the knout, strappado, and the rack; and hundreds of peasants at a time have burnt themselves together rather than submit to the destruction of their traditions and orthodoxy. Statesmen, however, know that a people capable of such strong convictions, capable of united communal village life and ownership, and possessing such indomitable energy and intense religious exaltation, are an enormous potential force at once of cohesion and progress, likely to exalt the future of Russia against all her foes whether within or without. On the *moujik* rests the financial, military, and political power of the State, as well as its interior cohesion and prosperity; and his inclinations, ideals, and aspirations will play the principal part in remoulding Russia's future.

Yet the bulk of the Russian peasantry are nearly starving. The Emancipation Act of February 19, 1861, which enfranchised and

settled the former serfs of the nobility and half the rural population, and the second Act, of 1866, which settled the other half—the former State peasants—has wrought, so far, benefits only moral, for the misery of millions is frightful and constantly increasing. Occupying owners are being fast divorced from the soil, and this not because the Act of 1861, which was hampered by a desire to conform to the wishes of the nobility, destroyed the communal land system, for it gave each village commune the option; but because, whilst the new system of taxation is simply monstrous, a new economical system, contrary to all their traditions and ideals, is being gradually forced upon them. At first the peasant declined to believe in the authenticity of the Emancipation Act, for it was incredible that their Tzar should have wronged them so bitterly as to the land, and the Act must have been tampered with by the nobility. No declarations by Ministers or Emperor could disabuse them, until, after hundreds of rebellions and ten years of speeches, ukases, floggings, occasional shootings and other persuasions, the superstition began to give way, or rather to change its shape.

“The Russian popular conceptions of land tenure,” says Stepniak, “are exactly the same as those which prevailed among all European nations. Russian peasants hold that land, made by nobody and wanted by everybody, cannot be property in the usual sense of the word, but should naturally remain in the hands of those who work it. If the husbandman discontinues the cultivation of his holding, he has no more right over it than the fisher over the sea, or the shepherd over the meadow where he no longer pastures his flock. In Russia a peasant who has brought under tillage new land always obtained from the *mir* a right of undisturbed possession for a number of years, varying in its maximum from twelve to forty, but strictly conforming in each case to the amount of labour bestowed on it by the peasant and his family.” These notions are deeply rooted throughout the Slavonic world. The Balkan Slavs, according to Bohishitch, do not recognize a right of property in virgin land. There a tenant who has cultivated another man’s land for ten years becomes its owner and ceases to pay rent; and in Bulgaria, simple wage-workers acquire the ownership in that period, so that farmers change their labourers to prevent their own expropriation. In Russia, until Peter the Great, the popular notions of land tenure were common to all classes, including the Government. Prince Wassiltchikoff, in his careful study of the history of Russian agrarian legislation, shows that “the very word ‘property,’ as applied to land, hardly existed in ancient Russia, no equivalent to this ‘neologism’ existing in old archives, charters or patents, and the land being recognized as the natural possession of the husbandman, the fisher, or the hunter, who sits upon it.”

So ingrained was this idea, that when serfdom was introduced, and

one-half the arable land, with its 23,000,000 of population, gradually became the property of the nobility, the peasants could easier understand their own slavery than that the land should belong to those who did not work it. "We are yours," they said, "but the land is ours, *my vashi, zemlia nasha*," was the peasant's conception of serfdom. When, therefore, emancipation came at last, he did not expect that he would lose the land he had previously tilled. He thought the Tzar would keep the nobility "on salary," as he kept his generals; that the State, to nationalize the land, would buy out the landlords. The State, however, only gave small parcels of land to the freed peasants, the landlords getting the greater part. The husbandman could not live and pay his taxes, so parsimoniously was the land apportioned to him. The bulk of the peasants had to eke out with wage labour or starve, and many of them did starve. At the time of the Emancipation Act no agrarian proletariat existed, and no great capitalist class existed either, and the landlords' vast estates had to go out of cultivation, or their serfs be compelled to till them for hire. How the Government threw its enormous material and political power into the scale against labour, and how landlords and usurers, large and small, rapidly completed the victory over it, is a frightful and a pregnant story. We propose to show how this transformation of the independent serf into the dependent and enslaved freeman has been worked out, and how naturally and inevitably the Nihilist has been one of the products of the situation. Those who follow us in this study of the great qualities of Russian peasants—their trust and loving-kindness amongst themselves, their utter loyalty and devotion to the Tzar, turned so slowly and hardly into distrust and despair, and their deep and true piety, will probably follow us also to our conclusion, that no better or nobler materials exist on the face of this globe for the making of a strong and mighty empire, and the development of a vast community of free and truly religious thinkers and of free and true citizens.

In this consummation of the misery of the peasant and of disaster to the State, the two great agents have been railways and credit. Up to January 1883, 13,500 miles of permanent way had been laid down in Russia proper, the total amount of shares being about £22,000,000 sterling, of which the Government found (chiefly by foreign loans) 54 per cent. In 1884 the total of railway debts to the State was about one and a half times as much as the entire revenue of the State.¹ The railways are, however, as a whole, very prosperous; but there are good and bad, and the State leaves the extra profits of the best lines to the shareholders or individual capitalists, whilst it takes the losses to itself—that is, to the peasants—who, paying 83 per cent. of the whole

¹ Russian Almanac, 1886, p. 192.

taxation, really paid a group of individual capitalists, from 1878 to 1882, a tribute of 46,000,000 roubles yearly. In Russia, third-class passengers are 83 per cent., and pay 67 per cent. of the receipts, and the passenger traffic corresponds with the cycle of agricultural work. The peasant has to go about seeking work, and in March there is a sudden increase of passenger traffic of 19·5 per cent., in April another increase of 24 per cent. on March; in August the maximum is reached, to drop in September, and so on decreasing until March.

Paper money or credit is the second great means whereby the *moujik* is ground to the earth and starved. Before 1864 the bank of the State was the only one in Russia; in 1864 its capital was 15,000,000 roubles of its own, and 262·7 millions of private deposits, 42,000,000 only being advanced on mercantile paper. In 1877—thirteen years—the capital of all the banks amounted to 167·8 millions roubles, and the deposits to 707·5 millions, or more than threefold, and almost the whole (96 per cent.) was used in discount on mercantile paper, the bills under discount having risen to 500,000,000 roubles, the chief object being the manipulation of raw agricultural produce. In St. Petersburg, the centre of the financial system, the streaming out of money somewhat precedes the streaming in of corn, and double pulsation of money exactly agrees with the fluctuations of railway traffic receipts, which are at their highest in May and September. The money accumulates for a short time in the provincial banks, whence it flows to the local corn markets, where produce is stored in May and September. The spring money wave buys up for speculation the corn which could not, owing to the frost, be moved sooner. The autumn money wave buys of the producers, every village becomes a corn market, and the more (paper) money thrown on the market the greater the victory of the capitalist, for the *moujik* really pays the cost of the paper rouble depreciation. On the one hand, in the remote hamlets and villages where corn bargains are struck, the rouble keeps its buying power; on the other hand, in the three autumn trade months, 86 per cent. of the year's paper money is issued, and the depreciated "credit rouble" is then obtainable at its lowest price in all financial centres. All cash reserves and deposits are then utilized. Corn agents scour the empire with all disposable capital. Money—that is, "credit roubles"—is not really convertible, and only saleable at 60 or 65 per cent. of its nominal value. The peasant holds the money only long enough to dirty it. He then pays the taxes with it; the old dirty money is then burnt in a furnace in the courtyard of the "State bank," and new and clean money recommences the cycle of imposture.

The railway network, 993 miles at the emancipation, and twenty-two years later 16,155 miles, is still extending at the rate of about 800 miles yearly, and with it is ever extended the net of taxation increase, and "credit rouble" depreciation, in which the Russian

peasant is caught. As Stepniak puts it, the whole combines and acts as a colossal hydraulic starvation press.

But why, asks Stepniak, does not the peasant retain more corn for himself? It is not tempted out of him by high prices, but forced out of him by the despotic molecular action of the system which he describes as it exists and acts in the villages.

In 1871 an Imperial Commission established the fact that in the thirty-seven provinces of European Russia the class of former "State peasants" pay in taxes 92.75 per cent. of the average net produce of their land, whilst the former serfs pay 198.25 per cent. of the net produce! But how can this be? Is it not absurd? Not when we understand the smallness of the allotments and that peasants of both classes can get from their land only about one-third of their livelihood, having to seek the remaining two-thirds as day labourers, home artisans, *métayers*, and so forth. With the Russian climate and system of husbandry a peasant family of seven or eight members can cultivate fifty-four acres, but can get only about a fourth of this. The result is an indescribable economical chaos. In a bad year peasants run after work at starvation wages, in a good year they care nothing for landlords, because they are harvesting their own crops, earning at the same time wages, rent, and the profit on capital.

Professor Engelhardt, writing from the Smolensk province, maintains that very high wages would be better for the landlords than these perpetual variations; and M. Giliaravsky, writing about the opposite extremity of the empire, the region of the enormous cereal plantations of the middle Volga, comes to the same conclusion, saying that in his country professional usurers and landlords of 150,000 acres are the only undoubtedly solvent persons. The issue of all this is that the landlords are now trying a direct and brutal system of constraint—the *kabala*, or serfdom revived.

The Russian poet, Uspensky, has painted a gallery of portraits of peasants—Havrila Volkov, Ivan Bosykh, and others—depicting to the life the terrible wrongs and brooding passions of the peasant class:—

"Every time I happen to meet the peasant Havrila Volkov, I think how dreadful it will be when he lets loose the fierce hatred and rage which lie hidden in the depths of his heart. He is now about forty years of age, and was born and grew into manhood in the days of serfdom, which at last he saw abolished. Bright hopes grew, and the hateful past seemed blotted out for ever. Yet people had to work harder than ever, for the peasant land had been curtailed and their expenses increased. Havrila's family was ruled by a despotic father, who took all the money earned by his sons and kept the family in comparative affluence. A constant rage gnawed at Havrila's heart, the family had eaten up his earnings. Taxes increased, work grew heavier, and the old man squeezed him closer.

If the horse should perish it would be all over with their independence. They had tried to rebel, but the father had the support of the *mir*, who could flog irreverent sons. At last the father died. Havrila and his wife started a new household, but now he was the only full-grown labourer, and, instead of rising, he sank.

"Ivan Bosykh was a person of totally different temper and nature. The history of his ruin is instructive because commonplace. There are hundreds of thousands of Ivan Bosykh's, and the chief instruments of their ruin are the *koulaks*. His land was curtailed and taxes increased, but he struggled bravely until his horses and cow were killed by the murrain. He bought a horse of the *koulak* on credit for thirty-five roubles, which horse cost the *koulak* fifteen; but as he refused to sell hay to the *koulak* at half-price, the latter tried to take the horse away. Ivan resisted, a complaint was lodged, and by a glass of wine here, and a bottle of beer there, a verdict was procured to take the horse from Ivan and give him twenty strokes for boxing the *koulak's* ears. He would not go to be flogged. 'What,' said he, 'our lords flogged us when serfs, and now a plain *moujik* like myself can flog me!' Ivan appealed, but the *koulak* and an elder broke down the door and took the horse off. A rage took possession of him. His wife wept, and he flew at her, then drank and drank away his senses. There were further quarrels, and he rapped the 'snouts' of his assailants, for which they sentenced him to one hundred strokes; a mortal anguish gnaws at his heart. The evil one whispers in his ear. The 'red cock,' or arson, is now not rare. The meek are beginning to turn, and agrarian crimes, like those once rife in Ireland, occur. Sometimes there is a solemn public execution of their oppressors, as when peasants in the Insar district passed at public meeting a resolution to kill the land agent, and went and killed him."

Rent has risen in the thickly populated black earth region, three or fourfold since emancipation, and when the tax-collector's patience is exhausted, it is followed by severe floggings and forced sales. The peasant often looks round for some 'benefactor' or usurer; of these the more numerous have been peasants themselves, and are generally very influential members of the village commune. In 1879, in the province of Onfa, the whole harvest was bought from the peasants for an advance of twenty kopecks per *poud* (40 lb.), and was resold to them the next autumn for one rouble twenty kopecks (120 kopecks) per *poud*, making an interest of 500 per cent. for about eight months. In the Saratoff province whole districts are in a state of bondage. There is no province or district in which the system does not extensively obtain. The very implements of agricultural work, cattle, and the land are often pledged, and almost always lost, and the peasant without his cattle is hardly a tiller of the soil, and loses his imprescriptible right as a member of the village

community. Mr. Ertel, writing about one of the Tamboff rather favoured districts, states that 25,258 peasants' households, or one-third, pawned some of their land every year; and Mr. Tereshkevitch, chairman of a statistical board, shows that in the Poltava province the land of the former Cossacks, inalienable by law, is concentrated to the extent of 24 to 32·6 per cent. of the total area in the hands of rich *koulaks*. The chairman of the St. Petersburg Congress of Russian Farmers, held on the 4th March 1886, stated in his speech that since emancipation the number of proletarians had increased at least from 15 to 20 per cent. This showed that one-fifth of the whole population of the Empire (one-third of the rural population of Russia proper), or about 20,000,000 of souls, were agrarian proletarians, thus equalling the number of serfs before emancipation. The only thriving estates were those where the proprietors use bondage or *kabala* labour, those of *mir*-eaters and usurious landlords, and perhaps also of peasants with large families. Thus, if nothing happens to check the process of village disintegration, we shall have in another generation, on the one side an agricultural proletariat of sixty to seventy millions, and on the other a few thousand landlords, mostly *koulaks* or *mir*-eaters, in possession of all the land. The peasant, despoiled and enslaved, repays his taskmasters by doing his "level worst," in negligence, slovenliness, dirtiness, and inefficiency. The system has partly killed the peasant, will kill the landlord next, and the petty usurer last. The mean mortality in Russia is 100 per cent. greater than in Sweden, 112 per cent. greater than in Norway, 64 per cent. greater than in Great Britain, 37 per cent. greater than in Germany, and 39 per cent. greater than in France. According to Dr. Farr, mortality over 17 per thousand is abnormal, and in England, whenever the death-rate reaches 23, a medical and sanitary inquiry is prescribed by law. The 1885 Congress of the Society of Russian Surgeons expressed the opinion that the primary cause of this frightful mortality was deficiency of bread; in other words, the reduction of one-seventh in the peasants' consumption of bread as shown by corn exports and production—and the medical report shows that the mortality is greatest where the land produces most. That mortality, always on the increase, reached, in the thirteen provinces—the whole of Central Russia—62 per thousand per annum at the last census (1882), and over a large area of open country is greater than that in the towns.¹ Official returns, from 1874 to 1887, showed the number of able-bodied young men decreasing every year with appalling regularity. In 1875, seventy-one and a half per cent. were accepted for military service, but the rate went down steadily till, in 1883, it sank to 59 per cent., or a decrease of 12½ per cent. in nine years from amongst the flower of the nation at twenty years of age! "Insolvent peasants are flogged in crowds, and alone." During the winter of

¹ Professor Janson's *Statistics*, vol. I. p. 264.

1885-6, in one district, 1500 peasants were condemned to be flogged for taxes. "It is the tax collector's rod, and nothing else, that drives the peasantry under the wheels of the despoiler's machine." Usury, the rod, and the auction—for all these products of emancipation and progress Government is responsible. With the one hand it lends millions of paper money to *koulaks* and capitalists, and with the other it flogs the peasant into paying the taxes that pay for the depreciation, that starves to death seventeen per thousand per annum in the thirteen provinces every year, and beggars one-third of the formerly independent peasants. The wider the ruin and death the richer the *mir*-eater, and the better equipped for a wider ruin still, whilst the more frantic and numerous become the crowds who must pay him cent. per cent.

What, then, is the remedy—or is there one? The remedy is only too obvious. *The peasants must have the land.* Less than one-third (27 per cent.) of the cultivatable land is held by the peasantry. In European Russia the cultivated land is but 21 per cent. of the whole area. "Were the Russian European fields," quotes Stepniak, "cultivated as those of Great Britain, Russia would produce, instead of 650,000,000 hectolitres of corn annually, about five milliards—enough to feed 500,000,000 souls.¹ But," he continues, "*only a free Russia can and will undertake so radical a reform.* Suppose the autocrat, head of the privileged of every class, transformed into a Tzar-democrat, I affirm that the most radical agrarian reform *without the abolition of the present political organization* would be quite inadequate to improve permanently the condition of our peasantry. No fewer than 20,000,000 of the peasants are unable to cultivate the little land they possess, for lack of cattle and implements—that is, of industrial capital; without cheap credit they would have to go again to the *koulak*, or *mir*-eater, who is, as often as he likes, head man of the *volost*, or manager of finances to the *mir* itself. All that can be plundered is plundered—money sent for the starving, money advanced for seed corn, corn in communal granaries, all is stolen, and if the taxes are embezzled, the peasant pays again." The peasant's loans and savings banks themselves often got into the hands of *koulaks* and swindlers. *Les beaux esprits se rencontrent*; and whilst managers, communal clerks, parish beadle, and rural notabilities borrowed to re-lend to peasants at usury, high-class robbers stole their millions.

The third thing necessary to Russia's salvation is the spread of elementary and professional education amongst the rural classes, but that, again, the autocracy would not tolerate. Thus by every road we come to one conclusion—that the abolition of the bureaucratic despotism, and the transformation of the autocratic empire into a

¹ E. Reilus, *Géographie Universelle*, vol. v. p. 859.

free constitutional State, is the *sine quâ non*. Not one good and adequate measure can now be adopted, for it would threaten "the system." The selfish fears of autocracy stop the way.

"Hundreds of millions," says our author, "extracted from the peasants are spent in supporting the nobility, or landlords, or in subsidizing great manufacturers. For favoured trades prohibited tariffs are levied, wars of conquest undertaken, and conquered provinces cut off by cordons of custom-houses of the interior. And when, in 1871, the more enlightened and liberal part of the privileged classes unanimously condemned the injustice of the present fiscal system, and petitioned for a progressive income-tax, equitable for all, Tzar Alexander II. pronounced the measure too subversive, too likely to alienate the *koulaks*, usurers, sharpers, and swindlers of every sort. Attempts at improving the condition of the masses are regarded as sedition, and are opposed by the censorship and the police. Democratic monthlies, such as the *Annales*, the *Slovo*, and the *Dielo*, were suppressed as revolutionary, because they held continually the torch of truth and science over this abyss of popular suffering."

When the agrarian question presses too much, or unusual cruelty, cheating, and malversation occurs, the press invariably receives secret orders, as on June 12, 1881, and June 26, 1882, "not to excite public opinion," or it is "absolutely forbidden to publish," &c., or to commemorate in any form the twenty-fifth anniversary of emancipation. The Imperial Government does not purposely ruin the peasants, who are the nation, but for its own mere selfish interests it purposely supports those who are ruining it. The whole of educated Russia is oppressed, but what are their sufferings compared with those of the dumb millions? "What an ocean of degradation and despair is in those dry figures which prove that hundreds of thousands of households have been forced to sell by auction all their poor possessions; that millions of peasants once independent have been turned into *batraks*, driven from their homes, their families destroyed, their children in 'bondage,' their daughters prostituted, and untold numbers of full-grown and even grey-haired respectable labourers have been shamefully flogged to extort taxes!" The only difference between middle-class and peasant opposition is that the latter think the Tzar blameless, whilst the former know better. The peasants have to be disabused of this nonsense, and if anything could dig for Russian tyranny a lower depth of contempt beneath the lowest, it is this foul abuse of the so touching and childlike confidence of the Russian millions in the good intentions of their master.

In the chapters on "the *moujiks* at home and the Russian democracy," Stepniak says that when, twenty-years before the emancipa-

tion epoch, Russian democrats first sought to know their peasant brethren the *moujiks*, they were startled to find them not degraded by serfdom, but united in their semi-patriarchal, semi-republican village communes, showing great self-respect, and standing boldly for their communal rights. Diffident with strangers, they were frank and truthful, dutiful and loyal, amongst themselves. With no notion of science, and believing that the earth rested on three whales, yet their traditional morality, deep humanity and wisdom, struck their visitors with a wonder and admiration that gradually spread to the reading public, and laid the base of that democratic feeling which has since never died out. But the multitude of writers soon no longer expressed unmixed admiration. The fountains of the great deep seemed breaking up. "Something harsh, cruel, cynical is worming itself into the hearts of the agricultural population, where all was simplicity, peace, and goodwill. The terrible misery through which our people have passed has entered into their very souls. Yet all is not lamentation. Before the political struggle, had to come the domestic struggle—that against the *bolshak*, the despotic head of the household. The revolt against the *bolshak's* whimsical rule was the main cause for the increase, from 1858 to 1881, of from 32 to 71 per cent. in the number of independent households in the provincial population. Elementary education also has spread. In 1868, of 100 peasant recruits only eight could read and write. In 1882 there were twenty. Reading is spreading among the *moujiks*, and popular books sell by scores of thousands. New sects of the rationalistic Protestant type have made millions of converts, exclusively amongst the rural and working classes. And whilst, as Stepniak believes, the sources of religious enthusiasm are dried up for ever amongst the Russian intellectual classes, the genuine and earnest religious devotion of the masses will play an important part in their near future. But together with this is a slow but vast upheaval and demolition of old forms. Owing to the crisis wrought by civilization on the one hand, and economical ruin on the other, 'all is tottering to its fall'—orthodoxy, custom, traditional forms of life.

"Throughout all the variety of the Russian *moujik*, the sociable, open-hearted, great Russian; the dreamy, reserved Ruthenian; the practical, versatile, independent Siberian; and the timid Belaruss, our rural millions are open to the same arguments and present a remarkable uniformity in the higher general ethical and social conceptions. Generations back they fought for dogma, now they unite on social and ethical views. The change is extraordinary and complete."

For thirty years the *Rascolniks*, founded in the seventeenth century, were hunted down, and the appeal to brute force in the unprecedented persecution of men and women of unquestioned

morality, fanned, in fifty years, their small spark of religious exaltation into a huge conflagration. The two fingers—emblem of the Rascolnik's cross and creed—shown to the awe-struck crowd from amidst the flames of the stake, produced a stronger effect than any preaching or arguing. On a Sunday morning in Tumen, in Western Siberia, in the early Rascolnik days, the *pops* were celebrating mass according to the new missal, when at the appearance of the wafer a woman shouted: "Orthodox! do not bow! They carry a dead body—the wafer is stamped with the unholy cross, the seal of Antichrist!" The woman and the man with her were knouted in the public square, but another Rascolnik, the monk Danilo, shortly after appeared on the same spot and began to preach, so that girls and old women began to see the skies open, and the Virgin Mary with the angels holding a crown of glory over those who refused to pray as they were ordered, and hundreds of them soon after chose the stake rather than recant. In many of the sects, as the Caucasian *Shalaput*, founded little more than a generation ago, the members are kept together as a strong organic whole by the complete uniformity of their social and ethical views, and whilst differing widely on dogmas, which they leave as "irrelevant," they exalt the ethics of the Gospel as the supreme religious truth. The *Shalaput* may be the only sect in which there exist, in working order, some practical examples of Christian communism. There are four such associations in the Northern Caucasus; one of them consists of forty households. The fences have been removed, clothes and household utensils are the only things which every family keeps to itself; all the rest is common property, and all are one as regards both production and consumption. The produce is divided into four parts, one being distributed between the families according to the number of eaters.

In Stepniak's second volume, that on the religions of Russia, he asks what is the cause of this phenomenal endurance and patience of our millions, and what will religion do for Russia's future? And he considers that the new evolution of religious thought which now covers almost the whole field of their intellectual activity acts at present as a safety-valve; almost their whole moral and intellectual force now runs in the channel of religion, and it engrosses the leading minority who alone could put themselves at the head of any vast popular movement. The Russian peasant is certainly religious; in every-day life he utters God's name at every step, and his will and biddings are constantly accepted as the base of the moral and social code. He will say to his employers, "I know you will settle with me in a godly way;" that is, without taking advantage. Two sons disputing about their inheritance will choose an old man as arbiter, and say, "Judge between us in a godly way," which means according to the highest standard of his moral consciousness.

Jesus Christ taught men to love one another. His personal human charm and the poetry of his life have been the chief power where-with the high devotional altruistic instincts of men have been stirred and riveted upon God, and acts inspired by religion have all exhibited the same characteristics of indomitable energy, straightforwardness, and intense exaltation, which measure neither the sufferings to be undergone or inflicted. Having by its very nature access to the most primitive intellects, says Stepniak, the promptings of religion have permeated rapidly the body politic, exercising a great and often an irresistible force, shaking the firm rock of popular apathy to its foundations, and stirring millions physically and morally when no other force could have done so. This is what we mean when we say that the Russian people are religious, and their religion is a mighty force for future advances. Still, however, the Russian peasants wallow in superstitions. Hardly a nation in Christendom has a demonology so well elaborated and deeply rooted. Sorcerers hold their own in the face of the *pop* or accredited minister. Fishermen still offer small sacrifices to the river gods, and each household does the same to its household deities, whilst in the popular legend, "Noë the Godly," the devil is regarded as the junior brotlier of God and his partner in creation. It is his *métier* to drag men to hell, but he cannot help it, and he is capable of unselfish attachment. Jesus is considered as the champion of the people, always with the poor *moujik* against the rich, but God the Father appears in the popular legends rather as a hard task-master. The *pops* are not respected by the *moujiks* and have no moral influence or confidence with the masses. The *pops* are looked upon as tradesmen who sell sacraments wholesale and retail, and as a matter of fact they hold a monopoly and haggle over every penny. The churches are not houses of prayer but of plunder, the chief cause of the deep-seated estrangement between the people and the orthodox clergy. It is therefore the rite and not the religion that the *moujik* cares for, and if the *pop* be the right *pop*, and the words be uttered in the right way and in the right place, it is enough. The religious force is dormant, but there it exists and is incalculable. It shows itself in the founding of its more than 200 sects, it is the grand enigma of Russia, and has never been rightly developed. Perhaps in no other country are the whole educated classes now so thoroughly imbued with the spirit of free thought; the intellectual barriers between classes are falling, and the most gifted of the peasants, who alone can lead the masses, can now find their way to the light. "Vast communities," says Stepniak, in his admirable historical chapter on the *Rascol*, "communities composed of from twelve to fifteen millions of men, everywhere present the widest intellectual differences, and whilst the more advanced elements of the *Rascol* have ceased to be *Rascolniks* at all, there is sufficient

proof of the vastness and intensity of their religious rationalism to show in what direction they are moving."

The New Testament was a rare book in Russian villages until quite recent times. Their clergy never thought of making a translation into modern Russian. Thanks to three English clergymen—Paterson, Pinkerton, and Henderson, founders and promoters of the St. Petersburg branch of the London Bible Society—the Russian version of the New Testament was published in 1824, and in 1826 the branch was suppressed by the Emperor Nicholas, and denounced as a "revolutionary association intended to shake the foundations of religion."¹ But the New Testament was not withdrawn from circulation, and new reprints were issued. The Society was resuscitated under another name, but again suppressed by Alexander III. in 1884. The synod and clergy in office cannot allow any other than the regular village *pops*, under their absolute control, to interfere in their business. The Russian Testament was enormously popular. The only means now resorted to by the peasants to awaken the religious spirit is the simple reading of the Gospel, but what they read in its words now is very different from what their forefathers understood. The leading section of the masses has taken, in the last two centuries, a step forward. It stands now upon the same level where a century ago stood a small minority—the old rationalistic sects; as to the minorities they have stepped out of the tutelage of religion altogether, and are fully able to participate in the stream of positive scientific European thought. The flower of our working men turn Socialists, read Mill, Spencer, and Darwin, Kostomarov and Setchenov, Turghenev and Ostrovsky, just as the privileged classes do, and for the most part turn Freethinkers. They are one with the whole of educated Europeanized Russia, upon which the future and present salvation of Russia depends. The rationalistic sectarians of the villages are open to all influences, and thus our rural religious culture is by no means hostile to the strongly positive culture of the towns, marching forward on the same road and to the same goal, following though at a certain distance. The rationalistic sects challenge existing institutions before the tribunals of reason and conscience. The negation of the authority of Government, whether absolute, as with the *Dukhoborzy*, or conditional, as with all the rest of the rationalists; may become one of active instead of passive resistance, for religion can express everything, and assume any shape. What is certain is that the spirit of active rebellion is growing among the peasantry outside sectarianism. Rich in labour combinations, and in the higher domain of thought, the Russian popular mind has been too sterile in politics. Thanks to interior emigration, they had not to stay and fight out matters; they had no suggestion of the rich inheritance of

¹ "The Russian Bible Society," by Pypin, in the *Vestnik Evropy*, 1868, vol. vi. p. 264.

Roman civilization, and their agricultural classes were intensely patriarchal, and so the legend of the Tzar-Tribune remained and grew. That, says Stepniak, is the tragedy of our history, whilst the Tzars identified themselves more and more with privileges and the bureaucracy. Patriarchal institutions nestled within the village communes, showing a marvellous tenacity and adaptability, and the ideal of patriarchal government excluded that of popular republics. The despotism of the *mir* and that of the family have both been discredited. They were a school in which the best national qualities were developed, but it is to them we owe the enormous tenacity of that plague of Russia, the superstition of the Tzar. The Tzar's authority was the *mir's* authority magnified. He was the common father, "pitying everybody," like the *mir*. The nation's riches were his, as the communal forests and meadows were the *mir's*. But the two pillars of Russian patriotism, the *mir* and the family, have vastly changed—the *mir* for the worse, the family for the better. The land question is one of life and death. Every *moujik* has been educated in principles of land nationalization, and hopes for the periodical redistribution of the land. Professor Engelhardt thus explains the illusion:—

"At certain periods—namely, at the taking of the census—the peasant thinks there must be a general redivision of land all over Russia, as there are now and then local redivisions of land within the boundaries of each commune. The communal redivision which actually takes place means the equalization of the shares of land held by the various households. The general redistribution would be the equalization of the shares of land held by the different communes."¹

Every *moujik*, adds Stepniak, rich or poor, proletarian or land-owner, *mir's* man or *mir*-cater, holds the same views, and all wonder why the Tzar tarries so long. It was the principle of the Jewish Jubilee, and is a sound and thorough economical theory of land nationalization. But the Tzar and the nobles were as fatally hostile to these rights and institutions of the people as were Jewish priests before and after the restoration. *Land re-distribution is labour re-creation*, and all the principles of progress and combination await the issue. Redistribution would secure revival and arrest decay, and if the nation obtains control over the political powers within a measurable time, land nationalization will be as easy and peaceable as Stepniak declares it to be unavoidable. The spirit of organization and trust is ingrained in the *moujik*, and no people are so well trained for collective effort. Whenever they have common trade interests to look after, they form themselves into an *artel*, or free and friendly trades union, and these often become life-partnerships, though membership is voluntary and terminable at the end of the season or of the particular work, and expulsion the only penalty. The remarkable thing is that all these *artels* reproduce in principle

¹ Engelhardt, p. 511.

the leading features of the village *mir*. Fishermen of the north, carpenters going to towns, bricklayers and builders, diggers and freight carriers—all the hundreds of thousands of peasants who seek work—either start by forming *artels*, or join them on arrival. Every *artel* accepts work and divides it as a body, every man's pay being proportioned to his work. Some *artels* are regular owners of industrial establishments or trading companies, others only temporary and limited associations of vast numbers of men blown together by the four winds of heaven. Plots of land are rented by *artels* of five, six, or more peasants. This is practised everywhere. The peasants join capitals, hands, and profits, and execute the work with almost military precision and regularity. Any given quantity of the working power of a village can be produced at a moment's notice, and the accounts are kept in the memories of all and of everybody of the whole year's budget of public labour. Large marshes are drained, big ditches dug, bridges built, and meadows mown belonging even to five or ten villages. Men, horses, waggons, implements are forthcoming; they divide the work, make the most complicated mental calculations, and keep all accounts without paper or pencil, and as a rule without hitch or friction. Long training has developed in the *moujiks* thorough honesty and self-command.

These are some of the facts and reasons whereon the able author of *The Russian Peasantry* builds his confident hope that, with or without revolution, Russia will become free, and that her freedom will take the shape of national co-operative Socialism.

J. A. PARTRIDGE.

PRACTICABLE SOCIALISM.¹

THE problem of the poor is one that offers itself at the present moment for the consideration of every thoughtful mind. Few who have given due heed to the signs of our times can fail to see trouble in the air. The spread of education amongst the masses has brought with it the natural result that the poor man, who in olden days took his surroundings for granted, is now questioning the justice of his position, and beginning to demand radical change in the conditions of society.

The man of more advanced culture, is also ready to admit the need of change; but from both standpoints there loom dark shadows of very real difficulty—such difficulty, indeed, as may only be overcome by resolute facing of facts, and by an unselfishness of aim and deed that shall have power to draw all classes together in brotherly bonds.

Any practical suggestions as to the growth of friendliness between rich and poor are to be gladly welcomed, especially when such suggestions are the outcome of personal experience. And, in a small volume now before us, entitled *Practicable Socialism*, there is much that is original, interesting, and suggestive. The joint-authors, the Rev. and Mrs. S. A. Barnett, set forth in a short preface their views and aims:—

“The following essays,” they say, “have been written at different intervals during our fifteen years’ residence in East London. They were written out of the fulness of the moment, with a view of giving a voice to some need of which we had become conscious. . . . They are simply the voice of the dumb poor, of whose mind it has been our privilege to get some understanding. . . . It will be noted that two or three great principles underlie all the reforms for which we ask. The equal capacity of all to enjoy the best, the superiority of quiet ways over those of striving and crying, character as the one thing needful, are the truths with which we have become familiar, and on these truths we take our stand.”

So well has the stand been taken, and the truths brought out, that even those who may differ in matters of detail, can scarcely fail to gather much from suggestions, the result of years of loving service

¹ *Practicable Socialism: Essays on Social Reform.* By the Rev. and Mrs. Samuel A. Barnett. London: Longmans, Green & Co.

amongst the poor, of whom the writers speak with a knowledge that is personal and friendly.

In dealing with the "poverty of the poor" we come across some rather remarkable statements. For instance, in answer to the first question raised, "Why does not each man, woman, and child attain to the normal standard of robustness?" we read, "The teetotallers would reply that drink was the cause, but against this sweeping assertion I should like to give my testimony. . . . *The working classes as a rule do not drink.*" And, again, "The vast number of people who, while poor in money, are rich in life's good, who live quiet, thoughtful, dignified lives, are forgotten, and the word 'poor' means to many the class we may call degraded. But the first class is by far the largest, and the wide East-end of London (which the ignorant think of only as revolting) contains, at a rough calculation, say, *twenty of the worthy poor to one of the degraded.*" We quite agree that, "it is curious how widely spread is the reverse idea;" and it is astonishing to hear educated folk, sensible enough on most points, speak of the poor as "impossible" and only to be dealt with by the strong hand of the law. Oddly enough, too, it is just such, who in their ignorance will unhesitatingly speak of the shameful ingratitude of the poor, not seeing that if their accusation be true, it is for them, by reason of their greater advantages, to show their less favoured brethren an example of courtesy and long-suffering, constraining in its loveliness.

• But that those who *expect* gratitude often fail to find it, is no proof that the poor are lacking in appreciation of real fellow-feeling, and those who, like Mr. and Mrs. Barnett, come into personal contact with the world's drudges, can scarcely fail to be struck with their quick response to genuine friendliness. It is within our own experience that the bunch of early snowdrops, placed on the tiny coffin of a sleeping babe, has awakened gratitude, remembered through years of absence, whilst a trifling act of personal risk has proved the key to a nature described as "too hard to be touched by kindness."

One virtue there is, that is generally allowed to the poor, and their unselfish helping of one another is scarcely denied by their bitterest detractors; but perhaps few whose lives lie outside the working-world have met with such bearing of one another's burdens as the following:—

"One couple, whose united earnings have never reached fifteen shillings a week, whose house has never been more than one small room, has brought up in succession three orphans. The old man, at seventy years of age, just earns a living by running messages or by selling wife-work; but even now he spends many a night in hushing a baby whose desertion he pities and whom he has taken to

To understand the full meaning of such a story it should be read in the light of a graphic description of the actual position of the average "poor man." "We find ourselves face to face with the labourer earning twenty shillings a week. He has but one room for himself, his wife, and their family of three or four children. By self-denial, by abstinence from drink, by daily toil, he and his wife are able to feed and clothe the children. Pleasure for him and for them is impossible; he cannot afford to spend a sixpence on a visit to the park, nor a penny on a newspaper or a book. Holidays are out of the question, and he must see those he loves languish without fresh air and sometimes without the doctor's care, though air and care are necessities of life. The future does not attract his gaze and give him restful hours; as he thinks of the years that are before he cannot think of a time when work will be done, and he will be free to go and come and rest as he will. In the labourer's future there are only the workhouse and the grave. He hardly dares to think at all, for thought suggests that to-morrow a change in trade or a master's whim may throw him out of work, and leave him unable to pay for rent or for food. The labourers—and it is to be remembered that they form the largest class in the nation—have few thoughts of joy and little hope of rest; they are well off if in a day they can obtain ten hours of the dreariest labour, if they can return to a weather-proof room, and if they can eat a meal in silence while the children sleep around, and then turn into bed to save coal and light. They are well off indeed, only because they are stolid and indifferent."

Think of such a life, ye who take rest and comfort and quiet as your right! You, business-man, returning after a hard day's work to your comfortable home, where you can take your ease and recruit to your liking, think what it would be to go back to a home in which the one room does duty for kitchen, laundry, pantry, sitting-room, and bedroom, where the elder children must learn their lesson and the younger find their only nursery; a home, too, where there are neighbours to right and left, above and below, over whose doings you have no sort of control; and where in illness there is no refuge, and in death no mortuary beyond the one barrack-room.

And you, mother of happy little ones, who enjoy all the comforts you so gladly give them, think what it would be to have them *always* in your one room, no nurse to relieve you of their care; cooking, washing, and cleaning to be done, whilst the baby, who is "one person's work," has to shift for itself, and the next toddler is either under your feet, or absorbed in the suspicious silence that speaks of mischief. Picture, too, a new-comer on such a scene, and try to place yourself in the position of a girl friend of ours, who in ignorance and weakness found herself alone at night, with a two-days-old baby, and no one to help, except the young husband, tired

with his day's rough work, and, if anything, more afraid than its mother, of the wailing mite, whose language of cries was as Greek to its puzzled parents!

"But, surely," we suggested, "you could have got a neighbour to help you?"

"Not down here (an out-of-the-way corner in a mews), unless we could pay, and we *wouldn't* get back with the rent."

So literally was this resolution kept, that during a lengthened spell of "short time" the baby's little life hung in the balance for lack of the special food, which, in the rich man's home, would have been his as a matter of course.

And this last point suggests a special feature in the book before us. By a series of carefully drawn-up tables, Mrs. Barnett shows conclusively that, let a poor woman do her very best, it is impossible for her; at the present rate of wages, to provide even the actual necessities of healthy life for a family of moderate size. Space forbids quotation of these tables, but the facts they disclose are terribly suggestive, and force the reader to Mrs. Barnett's conclusion, that "the workman cannot keep his family as well as the pauper is kept."

And, if this be true of the man whose weekly wages amount to as much as £1 to £2, what shall be said of the still larger class where the earnings can only be counted by shillings? One such case is given in detail, the outline of which is as follows:—Mrs. Marshall, her husband in an asylum, keeps herself and her two children by working eleven hours daily as scrubber in a public institution; for this she receives 9s. a week and her dinner. Deducting the necessary items of: Rent, 3s. 3d.; firing, 1s.; washing, 6d.; clothes, 9d.; schooling, 2d.; total, 5s. 8d.; and there remains but 3s. 4d. to provide the mother's breakfast and tea each day, dinner on Sunday, and all meals for the two growing children. It should be noted, too, that the 1s. a week for firing and lighting does not allow the children a fire before they go to school, that three people have to be clothed on the handsome dress allowance of £1 19s., and that 6d. a week for washing includes the family's house and body linen.

"And how," asks Mrs. Barnett, "do the rich look on these facts? 'Well! 9s. a week is very fair wage for an unskilled working woman,' was the remark I heard after I had told these facts to mine host at a country house where we were eating the usual regulation dinner—soup, fish, entrée, joint, game, sweets, and hot-house fruit. 'Yes, about the cost of your one dinner's wine!' replied one of the guests; but then he was probably one of those ill-balanced people who judge people by what they are rather than by what they have, and he may have thought that the sad, lone woman, with her noble virtues of industry, patience, and self-sacrificing love, had, despite her hard manners, more right to the good things of this

world than the suave old man, owning fourteen acres of lawn on which no children ever played, and stating without shame, first, the fact that he used eighty-two tons of coal yearly to warm his own sitting-rooms, and then the opinion that 9s. a week was *fair wage* on which to support a good woman and bring up two children."

But we venture to hope that "mine host" is only typical of a small minority amongst those who can afford wholesale coal orders, and we heartily agree with Mr. Barnett that, "*the rich would not be so cruel if they would think.*" Nor do we consider there is exaggeration in the statement that "the study of the condition of the people receives hardly as much attention as that which Sir J. Lubbock gives to the ants and the wasps."

Yet, rich and poor are so bound together in one body, that no portion can suffer without injury to the whole. And it is certainly true that, whilst twopence a gross to the match-maker and twenty-two per cent. to the shareholder, means poverty and hardship to the former, it means, none the less, still deeper moral taint and injury to the latter.

If those who delight in a "bargain," and whose enjoyment of a new garment is enhanced by its cheapness, could only be made to pay the penalty of a visit to the factory or home (?) where it has been "slopped," there can be little doubt that in a marvellously short time there would be no longer the crying disgrace of such a work-tariff as the following, selected from various sources:—

Working-men's shirts, $\frac{3}{4}$ d. each.

Frisled tennis aprons, 5d. a dozen.

Wool hoods (elaborately trimmed—a full day's work), $4\frac{1}{2}$ d. each.

Cotton blouses (well made), $1\frac{1}{2}$ d. to 2d. each.

Heavy ulsters (good work, and nine tailor button-holes), 1s. 3d. each.

One poor friend of ours, a "best hand" in a ready-made mantle factory, has managed to bring up a family by dint of working sixteen to eighteen hours daily, during the season; but if the wearers of many-guinea mantles could look into that unwarmed workroom and could count the number of stairs to be paced between the workroom (attic) and fitting-room (basement), they would hardly be inclined to agree with the employers' statement that 3s. a garment is "too good" pay.

But, perhaps, as regards bargain-hunting, it is less the rich who err than the middle class, whose anxiety to make the most of moderate means blinds them to the fact that, in helping to grind the faces of the poor, they are also helping to cheapen the labour of their own sons and daughters. The under-paid clerk or mother's help is hardly better off than the abject poor, and to such an extent has the cheapening mania grown, that in more than one office known to us, a staff of educated workers is being under-paid in a

way that would, even yet, raise a cry of shame were not the ill-doing cloaked under the name of philanthropy!

On this subject we may have more to say at a future time; for the moment we have before us the problem of the poor—that is, of those who, by reason of the present social state, are cut off from the best blessings of life.

We assume that our readers will agree with Mrs. Barnett that, “a fair wage must allow a man not only to adequately feed himself and his family, but also to provide the means of mental cultivation and spiritual development.” Nor will any one differ from Mr. Barnett’s statement that, “the poor need more than food; they need also the knowledge, the character, the happiness which are the gifts of God to this age. The age has received His best gifts, but hitherto they have fallen mostly to the rich.” But there are some who will probably receive a mental shock in this piece of very plain speaking. “Generally it is assumed that the chief change is that to be effected in the habits of the poor. All sorts of missions and schemes exist for the working of this change. *Perhaps it is more to the purpose that a change should be effected in the habits of the rich.*”

Admitting, however, the truth of another pithy sentence, “each class has its virtues, but as yet they are unknown to each other,” and it follows that the first advance towards better knowledge must come from the class which has leisure to seek out those whose whole time and energies are absorbed in the struggle to live. But there are many who fully feel the force of all this, who would even agree that “selfishness is the curse of wealth,” as truly as “hopelessness is the curse of poverty,” who yet are uncertain how to translate sympathy into action. To such, the extremely practical suggestions of experienced workers will be specially welcome, and there are few who will not be able to choose, amongst many paths, some way in which they may safely walk.

The suggestions group themselves under the two heads of (a) individual, and (b) united action. As regards the first of these heads especially, there is much that is both novel and sensible; and although we should hesitate to endorse all Mrs. Barnett’s statements as to the uselessness of certain old methods, we fully agree that there is much to be done on all sides of the beaten track, and that the old, unless freely supplemented by the new, will not meet the needs of a developing age.

One underlying thought we would commend to the consideration of all would-be helpers of the poor: “We must become the friend, the intimate of a few.” And so true is this, that we believe one personal friendship may be of more actual benefit than the showiest work, which counts results by tens or hundreds. But friendship, to be of value, must be real, and it is not the hasty visitor, leaving

a tract and throwing in a "word of advice," who will win the confidence and gain the love, equally blessed to giver and receiver. The thoughtful consideration which is the basis of all true friendship must have full play between rich and poor, and will bring with it many suggestions of need. Apart from the body's wants, such things as music, art, flowers; country visits, and quiet, which are beyond the poor man's unaided reach, will become his in proportion as the rich man comes to feel that his wealth is but a trust for others, and that he is, in very deed, his "brother's keeper."

"The lives of the poor are joyless," writes Mr. Barnett, and yet the poor have, as a rule, a keen sense of beauty and of those subtler joys which the rich man accepts as his birthright. The chapter on "Pictures for the Poor," tells of the undoubted success of art exhibitions for the people in Whitechapel, and throws light equally, on the man of wealth, refusing to lend pictures for a fortnight lest his walls should look bare, and on the toiler, pausing before Mr. J. Bertrand's "Lesbia," to remark, "Well, I hope she will never have a worse trouble."

A capital, and somewhat amusing chapter, entitled "At Home to the Poor," suggests methods of giving pleasure which are well worth consideration. Its perusal recalls the memory of a first, unaided effort at home entertainment, and of a certain tea-table where the guests considered it "manners" to speak only in whispers, and to refuse the simple dainties they were constrained to follow with longing eye! But, dismal as it seemed, "the night we had tea with you" was looked back upon as a joy, and, speaking generally, few things give more pleasure than a friendly tea or an afternoon in even a London garden. Those who live in the country have still more to offer, and the memory of one "real good day" has a power to cheer, incredible to those who have no communion with the starved and stunted lives of the poor. Another suggestion for those who have helpful sympathy with the erring, is contained in a chapter on "The Young Women in our Workhouses." Here, again, the thought is to provide a friend for those who are sadly friendless, and such work has the advantage of being compatible with a busy mother's home-life. Then, for the young man of culture who would share his best with his poorer fellows, there is Mr. Barnett's scheme of "University Settlements." Briefly, the idea is a colony of university men, living together amongst the poor, and, guided by a competent head, lending themselves to all manner of brotherly deeds. Apart from those at liberty to devote themselves wholly to such work, it is suggested that "some would come for their vacation; others, occupied during the daytime, would come to make the place their home. . . . The one uniting bond would be the common purpose, 'not without action to die fruitless,' but to do something to improve the condition of the people." It is gratifying to learn that this scheme has

been carried into effect, and in at least two quarters of "horrible" London is doing good work amongst all classes.

As regards united and public action, much valuable information may be gained from the chapters on "Town Councils," "Charitable Effort," and "Sensationalism in Social Reform." The two latter also contain some useful warnings, especially against the impatience which cannot believe in the secret growth of quietly sown seed.

"A people's church" is an ideal that will probably not commend itself to all minds, although there is force in Mr. Barnett's argument that, "If the State educates the citizens, and admits its responsibility for the formation of their character, a line can hardly be drawn at a point which would exclude it from giving the people the means which are the best security for happiness and for morality."

But the much-vexed question of State interference is dealt with more fully in the chapter on "Practicable Socialism," from which the book takes its title. We need hardly say that Mr. Barnett's sympathies are not with the platform Socialist who would have reformation take the form of violent change. But, whilst allowing that things cannot go on long as at present, it is emphatically urged that "a change which does not fit into and grow out of things that already exist, is not a practicable change." In another passage we read, "The better plan is to consider the laws which are accepted as laws of England, and to study how by their development a remedy may be found. On the Statute-book there are many Socialistic laws. The Poor Law, the Education Act, the Established Church, the Land Act, the Artisans' Dwellings Act, and the Libraries Act, are Socialistic." How these laws might be better carried out is shown point by point, the writer winding up with the conclusion: "I can conceive a great change in the condition of the people, worked out in our own generation, without any revolution or break with the past."

It has only been possible to touch upon the principal points of this suggestive little book, but enough has been said to indicate how much lies behind; and none of our readers will regret making further acquaintance with writers who speak from the fulness of the heart, and who have caught something of the spirit of their Master, who, without striving or crying, worked in ways of quietness that were mighty to overcome.

A. R. NEUMAN.

INDEPENDENT SECTION.

[Under the above title a limited portion of THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW is occasionally set apart for the reception of able Articles, which, though harmonizing with the general spirit and aims of the Review, may contain opinions at variance with the particular ideas or measures it advocates. The object of the Editors in introducing this department is to facilitate the expression of opinion by writers of high mental power and culture, who, while they are zealous friends of freedom and progress, yet differ widely, on special points of great practical concern, both from the Editors and from each other.]

IN DONEGAL : A REPLY.

SHOULD at some future time the history of Donegal, from 1886 to 1889, be compiled from the speeches and literature of that period, the historian will find himself confronted with a task full of perplexity and anxiety ; and it requires no extraordinary degree of foresight to predict that the result of his labours must be both unsatisfactory and untrustworthy. It is, indeed, one of the most painful and unfortunate conditions of the present controversy raging round the Irish question that with a certain class of politicians, assertion has assumed the place of argument, and suppression or contortion of important facts is resorted to as a legitimate weapon of political warfare. In a word, truth is too often uncrowned and her rival allowed to reign supreme.

It is not my present intention to prove the accuracy of the foregoing proposition generally. The task, though simple enough, would be tedious to a degree, involving as it would a *réchauffé* of uninteresting controversies and hackneyed quotations. For the present my observation is pointed to an article entitled, "In Donegal," which appears in the July number of THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW. It occurs to me that whilst giving the writer full credit for a certain knowledge of portions of the New Testament, he has failed to grasp the intent and purport of the Ninth Commandment—viz., "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour." It is, however, abundantly evident from the article in question ; and it is only charitable to assume that its author has enjoyed but a very short experience of Donegal ; and that his conclusions have been drawn from a very cursory inspection of that extensive county. It is, moreover,

tolerably manifest that his "facts" are, without exception, the progeny of *ex parte* statements which have been accepted by him with that implicit confidence usual in a man more or less accustomed to inhale an atmosphere of truth. There remains yet one further observation of a general character to be made. From an article headed "In Donegal," one naturally expects to glean much interesting and valuable information respecting the entire county. In the present case it is lamentable to note that the writer has permitted his paper to degenerate into a personal attack upon an old and popular gentleman, of whom he in all probability knows nothing and cares less. It is a cruel blow dealt below the belt, and for this reason I propose in the following pages to examine and refute seriatim each of the writer's charges.

I claim to write upon this subject with some authority. I have had a life-long experience of Donegal. I am as familiar with the habits and customs of its peasantry as I am with its magnificent scenery, its noble mountains, and its ocean-beaten cliffs. I know personally all the old-established and much-abused landlords in the county, and I have an intimate acquaintance with that particular district recently honoured by a visit from the "Westminster Reviewer." Lastly, I have taken some trouble to investigate upon the spot every count of the indictment framed by that gentleman against Mr. Olphert, and I pledge myself not to write one syllable the truth of which I am not prepared to substantiate.

Dealing then with the Reviewer's contentions in the order in which they are written, I find, as might be expected, the somewhat threadbare comparison between the Irish and the English landlord in the forefront of his indictment. "In Ireland it is the tenant who does everything for the land." Though somewhat late in the day, it seems necessary to remind the writer that with no pretence of fair play can the Irish landlord be held responsible for the difference between the English and the Irish land *systems*.

True it is that in England the landlord drains the land and builds model cottages, but then he receives in return a rent fairly proportionate to his outlay. On the other hand, an Irish landlord is a mere rent-charger. The rents—even supposing them to be fully and punctually paid—never by any chance represent the letting value of the land. For instance, portions of Mr. Olphert's estate were recently inspected by a skilled English agriculturist, who afterwards stated that similar land, if situated in that part of England with which he was acquainted, would readily let from 15s. to 25s. per acre. For this land Mr. Olphert nominally receives from 5s. to 10s. per acre. Out of this small sum the landlord has to pay either the whole or half of the poor rate, according as the annual valuation of the holding is above or under £4. A heavy tithe rent charge is also imposed upon him although the Church is disestablished, and

in addition he is usually the chief supporter of the church under the voluntary system in his own parish. Add to these outgoings income-tax and crown and quit rents, and one is inclined to ask the "Westminster Reviewer" what margin he supposes is left to the landlord out of which to support himself and his family, without having to build "model cottages" and churches, to "drain lands and to keep gates and fences in repair?" Then must it be remembered that the Irish tenant is a favoured being in the eye of the law. Not only is he protected from increases of rent, but every facility is given him for reducing the annual payment to his landlord to a minimum; not only is tenant-right, which upon the Olphert estate runs very high, legalized, but in addition the value of any improvements he makes upon his farm are fully secured to the tenant even after eviction for non-payment of rent.

So far as I can see, no comparison can be made between the status of the English and the Irish tenants which is not altogether in favour of the latter.

I now pass on to the Reviewer's observations upon the nature of the land in Donegal. At first blush I was disposed to regard these as typical of that reckless and extravagant assertion which too often now assumes the functions of legitimate argument. The writer, however, ingeniously enough, professes to speak only of what he himself has actually seen; and the result reminds me forcibly of the old and very trite saying, "None so blind as those who won't see." Had the writer contented himself with an expression of the fact that there is very bad land in Donegal, no one would have been much the wiser, but no one could have negatived the truism. He might as well have asserted that there is bad land between London and York. This, however, is not the position he takes up: "What is not bog-land is gorse and rock, and what is not gorse and rock is bog-land." This assertion is sweeping enough in all conscience, and I shall best answer it by pointing out what the Reviewer *might* have seen. In order to approach Falcarragh, the visitor will either travel *via* Londonderry and Letterkenny, or *via* Strabane and Letterkenny. If he elects to enter the county *via* Londonderry he passes through the Valley of the Laggan, which is almost proverbial for its fertility and richness of soil. If he alight at Strabane and drives to Letterkenny, the visitor must pass through the Raphoe district, where grass lands are readily let at from £3 to £6 per acre. "Between Letterkenny and Dunfanaghy," writes the Reviewer, "the land was very bad, but from Dunfanaghy to Falcarragh it was worse, and from Falcarragh to Glasserhoo and Derrybeg, it was worst of all." This is pretty "tall" writing. Did the Reviewer close his eyes in meditation when driving through that portion of the County Donegal which lies between Kilmacrennan, Ramelton, and Milford? Was he reflecting upon the iniquities of landlordism

as he was borne along the road which skirts the Ards farm and the adjacent lands through Ballymore and on to Dunfanaghy? I could myself point out to him many good farms and much excellent land between Dunfanaghy and Falcarragh, and I decline to believe that he did not visit the celebrated Ardsmore on his way from Falcarragh to Derrybeg. Here is to be found the best of deep loamy soil, without a trace of that bog which met the eagle eye of the Reviewer everywhere. I have myself examined, within the last few days, a very heavy crop of fine upland hay, saved by the caretakers upon the Ardsmore evicted farms. It is not so long since a land valuer (Mr. Heron, C.E.) swore before the head Land Commission that the lands of Ardsmore were capable of growing wheat, and were suitable for dairy farming. Practical men will understand what all this means, and will estimate at their proper value the Reviewer's assertions respecting bogs, gorse, and rocks.

Nor is the land badly tilled, notwithstanding the Reviewer's assertions to the contrary. Mr. Olphert's tenants are well supplied with horses, ploughs, carts, seaweed, manure, &c. "Seaweed is the only manure possible," writes my observant antagonist. I admit freely that seaweed is most eagerly sought after, and is beyond doubt a most valuable fertilizer, and many a time have I seen peasants carting it miles up into the country, at a considerable cost to themselves. Admitting then the value of seaweed to the fullest extent, I have to ask the Reviewer what he believed was the object of those unsightly "middens," or dungheaps, which are to be seen at the end, or too often in front, of nearly every house in the country? The Reviewer professes to know something about the case of a tenant named Smullen; an unusually large area in front of this man's house is devoted to the purposes of a midden.

It is the same everywhere. "Those who run may read."

With reference to the Government valuation, the Reviewer's statements are without either justification or excuse. An inspection of the rate books in Falcarragh could have been obtained for the asking, and should have proved a matter of small trouble to a Westminster Reviewer *in posse*. It could there have been ascertained that the rents of farms upon the Olphert estate seldom exceed the Government valuation, and are often under it. The writer of "In Donegal" does not think he saw any "twopenny acres." I am certain he did not; for cheap as Mr. Olphert's land undoubtedly is—part of it is let, as I have already indicated, at from 5s. to 10s. per acre—none is rented at twopence.

I shall only follow the Reviewer in one more attempt, upon his part to prove universal poverty, wretchedness, and squalor in Donegal from particular instances, perhaps designedly, brought under his notice. "The most wretched looking sheep than can be imagined" attracted his attention, picturesquely attired in a "little flesh" and

tattered wool "for appearance sake." Had this writer turned away from the habitations of men and the cultivated lands, and pursued a healthful walk through Mr. Olphert's Keeldrum mountains beyond, he would have seen hundreds of excellent sheep, and in all probability would have met with two flocks of remarkably fine Scotch bred "black faces," numbering in all about "ten score," the property of two tenants taught within recent years to believe it a crime to pay their landlord a rent of £4 2s. 6d. and £1 respectively, and a terrible hardship to disburse twopence per head for the privilege of grazing their flocks during the whole summer upon one of the best sheep walks in Donegal!

The anecdotes of "Paddy, the Pioneer Farmer," and the "Electro-Silver Teapot," related by the Reviewer, as illustrating his theories, are admirable in their way, and perhaps eminently suited for platform purposes, but unfortunately for their author, they lack the one qualification of *possibility*, so essential for sober discussion. Given the landlord with the most avaricious intentions, it is needless to say that he would find himself powerless to raise his rents in the manner described.

Upon one subject I am glad to find my own ideas in accordance with those of the "Reviewer."

The system of hiring out children is a demoralizing and hateful practice, and has already engaged the attention of more than one philanthropist. The source of this great evil and its remedy are both on the surface, but unhappily the latter is by no means of easy application. Over population, crowded upon holdings too small of themselves to support a family, constitutes the primary cause: emigration or migration, with consolidation of miniature farms, the only lasting remedy. In any case it is clear that where priest and philanthropist have failed the landlord is powerless to achieve solid results.

Give a peasant with a large family, huddled upon a small holding of, say, five or six acres, his land free of rent and taxes, and the custom of hiring out his children would still thrive and flourish. Paddy has nothing for his children to do at home, and his neighbours are amply supplied with families of their own; the Laggan thinly populated, and richly endowed by Nature, alone requires hands, and accordingly thither the overplus population will of necessity gravitate.

Up to this point the author of "In Donegal" has dealt with his subject in a more or less general spirit. I have indeed assumed that his observations are directed against Mr. Olphert, because from the first to the last page of his paper, no other landlord is alluded to by name, and the whole tenor of the article is manifestly to vituperate and hold up to public odium the only resident landlord within two extensive parishes. Any remarks, except the tea-pot incident, —which did not appear to me by any possibility applicable to the

Olphert estate—I have left unnoticed. Now the Reviewer throws away all disguise, and proceeds to give in his own fashion “a few examples from the Olphert estate alone,” of landlord oppression and tyranny, for the edification of the credulous. These examples are, save one, all old friends, and the total result of weeks of minute inquiry into the estate management and actions of Mr. Olphert during the last fifty years.

They have already been exploded in the daily press, and I shall demonstrate that these “examples” are either stated untruly (false witness) or that important facts, altering the complexion of an entire transaction, have been most unfairly suppressed.

No. 1 “example” is that of a tenant named Smullen. The gravamen of the charge in this case, simply stated, is that Smullen, having scraped together and borrowed £12 10s., duly paid that sum to Mr. Olphert, but that for some sinister purpose no receipt was given him for the money.

Smullen tells me that he owed three years’ rent—viz., £37 10s. How many English landlords would allow such arrears upon their farms? One year’s rent he kept in his house for months, intending to pay it to the agent upon the first opportunity. Of this sum he did not borrow one farthing.

He paid the money to the agent privately, and not at the usual time and place, and consequently Mr. Hewson had no receipt to give him, but promised to send it. It is not surprising that in the excitement and anxiety of the events which immediately followed the receipt was forgotten. There is no suggestion that the payment by Smullen is denied by the agent, and the whole affair reads like a poor attempt to exalt a mole-hill into the proportions of a mountain. The explanation of the Irish solicitor is truly Irish. A receipt is no doubt good evidence of payment, but surely the actual payment and acceptance of rent is conclusive evidence of the existence of a tenancy.

The next “example” is of an entirely different character, and so serious that, to avoid any possibility of misrepresentation, I quote the Reviewer’s own language:—“He” (Mr. Olphert) “drove off one set of tenants a generation ago, and filled their place with sheep from the highlands of Scotland, but the sheep died, and died, and died, because there was so little for them to eat.” From the first word to the last there is not a vestige of truth in this monstrous statement. Mr. Olphert never “drove” away a set of tenants and replaced them with sheep or anything else. It is well known in the district that, until the inauguration of the Land League, an eviction was a thing almost unheard of on the Olphert estate. The parish priest of Clougherneely has lived there respected and beloved for the last forty years, and I invite anyone who doubts my testimony to apply to him for its corroboration. The ridiculous assertion that these mythical sheep

died on such evicted lands for want of food demands no further comment.

The case of the officer of the King's Royal Rifles affords another instance of *suggestio falsi* on the part of the Reviewer. The old woman—or rather man—whose rent this officer paid, was not a tenant of Mr. Olphert's. Nor was the gallant officer “quickly removed to another part of the country.” He remained in Dunfanaghy until he went on two months' long-expected leave to London, and has since received his well-earned promotion, which, according to the rules of the service, compelled him to change into another battalion.

“And now for the case of Paddy Doohan.” The crucial test of the value of this “example” lies in the inquiry—When did Doohan build the addition to his house? It is plain that if the new wing was completed *before* the purchase of the second farm, the entire house must *ex necessitate* appertain to the original holding. The Reviewer observes and boldly grapples with the situation. “The other farm,” he writes, “Doohan had taken only four years ago. He had then added a piece to his house.” The truth is to be found in the exact converse. Doohan rebuilt his house nearly two years before he purchased the second farm. He must therefore have built upon his own land, or filched a portion of his neighbour's, a most unlikely alternative, having regard to the litigious character of the Irish peasantry upon all agrarian subjects. It is almost surplusage to note that Doohan has not invoked any legal redress since his eviction.

The “example” of James McGinley which follows is a flagrant instance of *suppressio veri*.

The Reviewer's story when boiled down amounts to this. That McGinley, having purchased a farm subject to a non-judicial rent of £15 7s., found when too late that a judicial agreement for £15 was existing between the landlord and the old tenant (Wilkinson). The writer does not mention that before McGinley appeared on the scene this farm had been actually sold to a man named Greer and the purchase-money paid over. It was then made so clear to Greer that he was not a *persona grata* to his neighbours, and that another man desired the place, that he entreated Mr. Olphert to allow him to cry off and return his money, which was accordingly done. In the meantime McGinley approached Wilkinson and offered a larger sum (£150) for the farm than Greer was able to pay, and said he would give £200 if Wilkinson would have the rent judicially fixed at £12 per annum. Wilkinson states that he then told McGinley that “the farm was so cheap that no one would venture into Court ‘for fear’ of having the rent increased.” In some parts of Ireland McGinley's conduct would be termed “land grabbing,” and in no view of the case does he merit any sympathy. His offer to Wilkinson proves that he bought with his eyes open, and, even according to his own showing, he became aware of the existence of a judicial rent before

the purchase was completed, and could then and there have recovered the money paid had he so desired. Wilkinson is a man in comfortable circumstances, and a good mark for a much larger sum. I am aware that some details regarding this case are in direct controversy between McGinley and Wilkinson, and I have therefore avoided dealing with them. Suffice it to say that Wilkinson is a man of superior intelligence, and high character, and I believe thoroughly incapable of doing a shabby action or taking a mean advantage of another.

With the foregoing "examples" of Smullen, Doohan, and McGinley I was quite familiar, but I was not prepared for the harrowing story of Kate Coyle, with which the Reviewer concludes his indictment.

For myself I should have been disposed to quote Mrs. Coyle's history as a fair instance of almost unexampled and even culpable landlord indulgence and forbearance.

"Thirteen years ago," says the Reviewer, Mrs. Coyle "got behind with her rent," and was evicted amid the usual conditions of frosty weather and little children, and worse than all, in direct violation of Mr. Olphert's promise to the contrary. I admit that this "example" came upon me with "somewhat the effect of a small bombshell." I at once sought out a man whom I knew to be intimately acquainted with all the facts, and I read for him the paragraph relating to Kate Coyle in *THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW*. His rejoinder was more forcible than elegant, but eminently satisfactory. "It is a lie," said he. "Kate Coyle has to my knowledge remained in undisturbed possession of her holding in Drumnatinnny for the last twenty-eight years." "Kate Coyle," he added, "was never depending upon one cow to pay her rent, she had plenty of horses and stock, but was wanting in thrift, and her family broke up and scattered away from her."

Here are the particulars of her holding: present rent, £4 15s., government valuation, £5. Half the poor-rate is payable by the landlord. For this small rent Mrs. Coyle has nearly 14 acres, including—according to my informant—"the best field in Drumnatinnny."

In the year 1882 Mrs. Coyle obtained the benefit of the Arrears Act, and so wiped out a debit balance of about £20. Seven years have hardly elapsed, and she owes again about a like amount. She complains that Mr. Olphert "never gives a halfpenny of reduction," just as if it were possible to reduce a minus quantity. Once more I ask—How many English landlords would allow their tenants to fall into similar arrears?

I have now completed my wearisome journey. With a heavy burden of uninteresting facts and details I have pursued the miry path traversed by the Reviewer, as with a light heart he scattered fiction and misrepresentation broadcast, here, there, and everywhere,

believing, perhaps, either that he was thus promoting the interests of the illegal Plan of Campaign among *Englishmen*, or—who knows—that he could thus co-operate best in the shameful task of “beating down” a popular old Irish gentleman—for popular Mr. Olphert undoubtedly is, and in this fact is contained the most eloquent refutation of much that the Reviewer has written. A man capable of perpetually harassing, evicting, and even cheating his tenants—I am not overstating the effect of the Reviewer’s indictment, provided it were true—would be a social leper in any country. It is admitted, however, that Mr. Olphert has gained a place in the hearts and affections of his tenants. The deputation of Leeds Radicals—to their honour be it said—gracefully and freely acknowledged this fact, and even Mr. Conybear himself followed suit, but endeavoured, most unfairly, to transfer the onus of blame for the present state of affairs from the landlord to his agent.

In conclusion, one question remains to be answered. If Mr. Olphert is popular, if his rents are low, if no cases of real hardship are to be discovered upon his estate, how comes it that his tenants have combined against him, and have adopted the Plan of Campaign? My answer is that the tenants, on their own initiative, have done nothing of the kind, and if polled secretly, honestly, and individually to-morrow, they would vote against the present system of terrorism, boycotting, and persecution almost to a man. They have been threatened and cajoled into resistance, and now they are being practically bribed into acquiescence. The Reviewer rants about King John and his barons, the ship tax and Hampden, as if some great constitutional principle were at stake in Donegal. Whatever parallel can be drawn between the machinations of the National League and the great events which secured to England her Magna Charta has been wisely left to the imagination of the readers of THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW. The name of Hampden, too, is associated in most minds with the best traditions of freedom and liberty; but to talk of freedom or liberty in connection with the Plan of Campaign is an abuse of noble terms and an insult to common sense. Hampden, indeed, refused to pay what he believed to be an unjust tax, but did not shrink from enduring the penalty himself, and at his own expense fought out his battle in the recognized courts of the realm. The Donegal Hampden, on the other hand, has no rent himself to pay to Mr. Olphert, and runs no risk of eviction, but, under the self-assumed title of the “Law in Gweedore,” derides her Majesty’s courts, and denounces the payment of rent by others except under such conditions as he thinks fit to advise. When, as sometimes happens, he is made to feel the power of the law of the land, the eternal “hat” goes round, and the balm of filthy lucre rapidly assuages the pain of wounded pride.

One man declined to obey the “Law in Gweedore,” opposed its

mandate openly and refused to consult its wishes—that man was Mr. Olphert; and for this reason the Plan of Campaign is rampant upon his estate, a quiet and beautiful country is desolate, and its peasantry hopelessly ruined. The incontestable proof of all this lies before me in the form of a copy of the celebrated letter, written prior to the Ardsmore evictions, by the curate of Clougherneeely (Mr. Olphert's parish), to the parish priest of Gweedore, the Rev. James M'Fadden. "It was at your instigation," writes this minister of religion (the Rev. D. Stephens, C.C.), "*I took up the flag here last year; you are therefore bound to be with us when the crisis comes, being in a manner responsible for the whole business.*" "You know what Olphert is, you know it will take all our united energies to beat him down. You have often wished for an opportunity to get the people united in stout battle against him. That opportunity is at hand." Nor, when he thus gaily wrote upon the subject of their approaching eviction, was this admirable priest blind to the probable results of the combat to his own flock. "It would simply ruin them for life," he frankly admits, ■ the event of no compensation being obtained from Mr. Dillon, M.P. Language cannot be clearer or stronger than this, and I now leave the Reviewer to reconcile the admission of the Rev. Daniel Stephens, C.C., with his own conclusion that "the Plan of Campaign has come to the help of the tenants."

HOME AFFAIRS.

WE write immediately upon the great triumph on the Tithes Bill. For this year, at any rate, the tithes question is shelved, and when next it comes before Parliament it will very probably take an altogether different shape. The defunct Bill will not, however, be forgotten. It is an amazing thing that a Ministry, which is supposed to be guided by Lord Hartington and Mr. Chamberlain, should have blundered so tremendously over a matter which has no relation to Ireland. In Irish affairs they are "capable of all," and it would have occasioned no surprise to find them giving the Coercion screw another turn. But that it should be calmly proposed to facilitate the collection of tithe in Wales by "county-courting" the farmer, can only be explained on the assumption that the Tory party, holding only four seats in the Principality, do not expect even to carry these at the next election. An exasperated Tory Churchman of the type of the Prime Minister, could alone have been guilty of it. For ourselves, we are thankful that Lord Salisbury has revealed himself. The Welsh Nonconformists now know what sort of treatment they would have had if the First Minister of the Crown had got his way. This knowledge is worth much to us, not only in Wales, but in England, and we expect from it the best possible results. It is no use to say, as the Tories no doubt will, that the Bill was not prosecuted to the end. A death-bed repentance is never very edifying, and those who have been the object of attack by the sinner, may well be excused if they are just a trifle sceptical as to its reality.

It was matter of wonder to friend and foe alike that, after the long contest over the question of the Royal Grants, and the prior sacrifice of Bills, in order, as was then said, to obtain an early prorogation, the Government should obstinately proceed with the Tithes Bill. To begin Committee on such a measure on the 12th of August was certainly not good tactics. A large number of members, taking a too literal view of the language held by Mr. Smith in June, had made arrangements to leave town about this time, and, as a matter of fact, over one hundred pairs had been arranged by the Whips. Thus, a third of the House of Commons was practically dispersed. Gladstonians, of course, do not pair with Liberal-Unionists, so that the Government were short of more than one hundred of their own loyal

supporters, to say nothing of the Liberal-Unionists, who, with less responsibility to attend, took wholesale leave. Lord Salisbury, of course, was not kept in the dark as to these facts, and he knew, moreover, that there were men on his own side who remained to oppose the Bill if it were taken. An address, largely signed by members of all parties, was sent him, asking him to abandon the Bill, and to bring in a complete scheme next year. Having declined point-blank to receive this address for several days, he found it convenient to relent. But in accepting the address, he decided to refuse its petition. When it was pointed out that there would be prolonged conflict, and that Parliament would have to sit until September to pass the Bill, he is said to have replied, "It will have to be carried if they sit till November." The secret of this obstinacy has, in part, at any rate, since come out. The Welsh parsons were in despair at the prospect of getting through the winter. The newly appointed Bishop of St. Asaph, who has already shown himself to be a rank partisan, had, with the Dean and Chapter, issued an appeal to his friends, asking them to put pressure upon their members in Parliament to fulfil their pledges on this tithes question by supporting the Government Bill. Lord Salisbury himself was, naturally, made fully aware of his own obligations to the Anglican parsons of the Principality, who, it was said, would be reduced to a condition of starvation if the tithe were not duly forthcoming in the next few months. Hence the resolution to proceed with the measure.

In a thin House, Mr. Smith began the work of putting the Bill into Committee. It needs hardly be recalled that the Bill simply provided for changing the procedure in recovering tithe by substituting the ordinary county-court process for distraint. It gave the parson his remedy without exposing him to the invidious necessity of seizing the live-stock or produce of his neighbour. Otherwise it did not touch the tithes question. There were on the paper some half-dozen or more "instructions to the Committee," all calculated to widen the scope of the measure and greatly to change its character. Mr. Herbert Gardner pressed for an arrangement for the redemption of the tithe, and in a division ran the Government very hard, the vote being 120 for the instruction and 138 against. Mr. C. Gray followed, from the Tory side, with a demand that tithe should be made recoverable from the landlord and not from the tenant. Ministers grew alarmed, and the Home Secretary was put up to say that the Government would be quite willing to prevent landlords for the future from contracting themselves out of their liability. This, however, did not satisfy Mr. Gray, and he carried into the Lobby eight other Tories and six Liberal-Unionists. The Government majority was thus reduced to 4—145 to 141. Mr. J. A. Bright was among the nine Liberal-Unionists who saved the Government. After this, matters began to improve a little for the Government, but

the fight was stubbornly kept up, and the Committee stage was only reached next day after the Speaker had ruled three "instructions" out of order. Then the conflict was resumed on the first clause. Mr. T. Ellis was for restricting the new remedy of county-court process to the clerical tithe-owner, excluding the lay impropiator altogether. When the Government opposed the amendment, Sir William Harcourt (whose speeches throughout had been of the most weighty character) said it was clear that the Bill was not simply in the interests of the poor starving clergy, but was equally for the benefit of the lay holders of tithes, including such men as the Duke of Bedford. He was against giving the latter power to "county-court" the Welsh farmer, and he thought it was a pretty thing that the Ministerialists, who were always posing as the "farmer's friend," should make this proposal. Public attention would not fail to be called to it. Of course, Mr. Ellis's amendment was rejected, but the Opposition were able to extract from the Government a provision against multiple actions for arrears, and another allowing the tenant three months' grace before action could be taken. At the end of the evening's sitting, the Government majority again dropped to 11 on an amendment by Mr. Seale Hayne to prevent possible hardship to a tenant who might have arranged with his landlord to pay the tithe. Here Mr. J. A. Bright was actually in the Lobby against the Government!

Whether this last division had anything to do with what happened next day is not very clear. But an amazing *volte-face* was performed by the Government. The House had returned to the work of considering the first clause, when the Attorney-General unconcernedly observed that the Government were willing to put the liability for payment on the landowner. Instantly, Sir William Harcourt moved to report progress, that the Opposition might have an opportunity of examining the Government amendments. Mr. Smith, being aware that the Opposition had gathered in full force, judiciously assented, and the further consideration of the Bill was postponed for forty-eight hours. The Attorney-General's amendment appeared the next day, and it then became evident that the Bill had been entirely transmogrified. To say it was the same Bill was absurd—there were hardly a couple of lines of the original text left. Under the standing orders it became a question whether such extensive amendments could be made in a Bill—whether it would not be necessary to re-introduce the amended Bill as a new measure. A collateral question had reference to the decision of the House upon Mr. Gray's instruction, which would have put the burden upon the landlord. That instruction had been rejected, and Sir William Harcourt put it to the Speaker to say if it were possible to go behind the decision of the whole House by action in Committee. The Speaker gave a guarded reply, but spoke adversely to the hopes of

the Government. When the Bill was to be resumed on the Friday, the other question as to whether the Bill, as amended, was not a new Bill, was in the same way put to the Chair. Mr. Peel declared that, after comparing the Tithes Bill as modified by the Government with the original Bill for which leave was given; and which had been read a first and a second time, he saw a complete difference between them. Nothing of the old Bill remained but the saving clause, the interpretation clause, and, he thought, two or three lines "at most." According to the practice of the House, when a Bill had been so transformed, it was right that it should come to them as a new Bill and pass through all its stages. After this, the Government had only one course open to them. The Bill was withdrawn, and, although Sir William Harcourt offered to give his help with a new Bill embodying the Attorney-General's amendments, Mr. Smith would make no promise to introduce the measure at that period of the session. A week's useless warfare ending in a series of ghastly blunders had, it seems, taken all the resolution out of Lord Salisbury. He had saved his honour with the parsons, and was content. It is understood, however, that he will not abandon them, and that the Executive will take sharp and decisive measures against any tithe-rioters who may appear in Wales during the coming winter.

It is not surprising that Mr. Gray should seize upon the surrender of the Government to bring in a Bill of his own, putting the payment of tithe upon the landlord. We have not had an opportunity of examining this particular draft, but it may very well do all it proposes without going the length of the Government. The Attorney-General's amendments contained some surprising proposals. Naturally the Government were very anxious to avoid penalizing their own friends, the landlords. For this purpose they fenced the landlord round with all sorts of provisoes. He was safeguarded in every direction—in one or two cases the protection given him was most suspicious. But the one matter of real importance was thus stated by Sir William Harcourt:—

"There is also introduced in this Bill for the first time the principle of the establishment of a universal land court. The Government have proposed that the county court shall be appointed to inquire into and investigate rent, and to see what relation tithe bears to rent, and if rent is not adequate to the tithe, that the tithe shall be proportionately reduced. That is appointing a land court of arbitration throughout the whole country to deal with all rents and all tithes. So valuable—some gentlemen would think so revolutionary—a principle has probably never been proposed by any Government, not to say a Conservative Government. Even if this Bill disappears, the principle it enshrines will remain. From a court of this kind to determine how much tithe shall be struck off on consideration of the value of rents and profits, and to ascertain what are the rents and profits, anyone can see that there is only another step to giving the land court power to adjudicate as between tenant and landlord. As there is power here given to reduce the tithe, power would come to reduce

the rents. These amendments of the Attorney-General would establish land courts with an absolute jurisdiction—I think without appeal—to determine the rights, *inter se*, of the tithe-owner and the land-owner.”

In rejoicing at the defeat of the Government, it is permissible to hope that their conversion to these views may hold out. For ourselves we wish they may never propose a worse Bill than that contained in the amended draft of the Attorney-General. We do not say it is enough in itself, and we know there are many men on our own side who think it goes in an entirely wrong direction. Mr. Ellis (the young and capable member for Merionethshire), who knows this subject as well as most men, declares that to put the burden on the owner is to penalize the tenant beyond anything which he suffers at present, and to add to this the terrors of possible eviction. The Welsh members generally are well known to be in favour of the wholesale application of tithes to national purposes—education and the like. And, as this object would rather be thwarted than facilitated by the adoption of the later proposals of the Government, they are not able to follow Sir William Harcourt in helping to push forward even “the revolutionary” measure which he so admirably explained in the language quoted above. Sir William, in offering his help to the Government, was careful to say he spoke for some of the Opposition only, and Mr. Smith, seizing hold of this admission, used it to justify his refusal to go on with the Bill. It is matter for regret that the Queen should be making a too-long delayed visit to Wales whilst the sounds of this keen political strife are still echoing throughout the Principality. And we cannot think it is a wise thing that the Queen’s daughter, the Princess Beatrice, should at this particular time appear in active association with the hated Establishment by laying the foundation stone of a new church at Barmouth. Ministers ought to have thought of these things when they determined to go on with the Tithes Collection Bill.

The legislation of the month has not been of any particular note. The Irish Light Railways Bill has passed the Commons, and is now safe from attack. The conduct of Mr. Salt, as Chairman of the Grand Committee which examined the details of the Bill, was, however, so singular as to do the Bill a good deal of prejudice even with those who were disposed to stand its friends. Mr. Storey, and other Radicals, who object to the execution of Irish local public works at the expense of the Imperial Treasury, and Mr. Biggar, and other of the Nationalists who look upon the Bill as a sort of bribe and of very doubtful utility, did what they could in the Committee by offering amendments to delay its progress and cause its withdrawal. They were frankly hostile to the measure. Thereupon Mr. Salt took it upon himself to say that the House had sent them the Bill to pass, and consequently he would rule out all amendments which, if adopted, would be fatal to the Bill as a Bill. Mr. Storey and his friends

protested, and, finding this in vain, took the opinion of the Speaker, who very cautiously, it is true, but very distinctly, pronounced against the ruling of the Chairman. Mr. Storey and his friends declined to return to the Committee, and the Bill was consequently rushed through and sent back to the House. It is against the practice of the House to recommit a Bill returned from a Grand Committee, but, as a result of Mr. Salt's ruling, the report stage of the Bill occupied a whole night. The further attempt to "amend" the Bill was not, however, particularly successful, and, according to Mr. Storey and his friends, the financial arrangements of the measure are wholly unsound. The Treasury will make advances to the promoters of lines, and these latter will be able to arrange with other persons, probably the existing railway companies, to construct the lines. But it is pretty certain that a considerable amount of money paid by the Treasury will remain with the "middle man," and it is by no means clear that the obligations put upon him will be rivetted upon the constructing companies, so that the proper maintenance and working of the lines are not thoroughly guaranteed. If this should turn out to be the fact, Mr. Storey and his friends will have ample justification for everything they have done, and we shall wish that they had succeeded in wrecking the Bill. It remains with the Nationalists who favour the measure, to see that the promotion of new lines under the Bill is not a mere excuse for jobbery. As to the Irish Main Drainage Bills, two of them are dead, and the position of the others is not very encouraging to the Government. It is, however, only a question of time to pass them, and, if opportunity serves, Mr. Balfour may force them through.¹ Here, however, he will have no such help from the Nationalists as they have given him in regard to the Light Railways Bill. A Technical Instruction Bill for England and Wales, introduced by the Government, has superseded Sir Henry Roscoe's Bill, stranded by the overpowering difficulty of the denominational question. The measure is of a limited character, dealing only with the secondary and continuation schools, so that a scholar must presumably have passed the sixth standard of the Code before he can have the advantages which the Bill offers. Happily the evening classes, working under the Science and Art Department throughout the country, are within the scope of the measure, but it is impossible to be satisfied with any scheme which absolutely excludes all the elementary schools of the country. The Bill can, therefore, only be accepted as an instalment, and, as the Government have taken Mr. Mather's amendments, bringing in the School Boards to help in the administration of the Bill, we see no reason why it should not pass.

The Peers have been engaged in the useful if modest work of "registering the decisions of the Commons." The Scotch Local Government Bill (with its free education clauses) has been put

¹ Bills since abandoned.

through the various stages almost without discussion, and we believe without any sort of amendment. All the talk of striking out the free education clauses was, it appears, so much talk and nothing else. Not a word was said on the subject, so far as we saw; and in view of this fact Mr. Chamberlain is quite justified, *pace* Mr. Balfour, in declaring that the system must soon be extended to the rest of the kingdom. In the same way the Peers have passed the Welsh Intermediate Education Bill. On one matter only have they contested the decisions of the Commons. In the Prevention of Cruelty to Children Bill the clause prohibiting the employment of children under ten years of age in theatres and other places of amusement has been so modified that courts of summary jurisdiction—the petty sessions and the stipendiary magistrates—have power to give exemption to children over seven years of age. Guarantees are in such case taken that the children shall be educated, and that their physical strength shall not be overtaxed. This is probably a reasonable compromise on a question which has produced a good deal of heated controversy, and it has very sensibly been accepted by the House of Commons. A quarrel with the Peers on this matter must have led to the loss of the Bill, which in other respects is a most valuable measure, securing very important advantages for children who are in the hands of dissolute and disreputable parents.

It is matter for satisfaction to be able to say here that the Bill for conferring responsible government on the colony of West Australia has made no progress during the month.¹ The Colonial Office seeks to bolster up a disgraceful concession by publishing, from time to time, the resolutions and addresses which come to it from the other Australasian colonies in support of the Bill. It hardly needs to be said that these addresses and resolutions are suspicious. The land monopolists of West Australia are persons of influence in Victoria, New South Wales, and elsewhere, and there is some reason for thinking that they are in part, at any rate, responsible for the demonstrations of the Colonial Governments and Parliaments. If this is not so, it is clear that the colonial authorities do not choose to understand the nature of the objection which is taken against the Bill in this country. We have nothing to say against giving West Australia self-government *per se*, but we do object to giving a handful of colonists on the coast full power of disposition over an imperial inheritance, comprising some millions of acres, extending inland over half the breadth of the Australian continent. And when Lord Knutsford appears in public to say that 80 per cent. of these lands are unfit for cultivation, we make answer that that does not satisfy us. They are possibly rich in mineral wealth—we do not know; but, whether this is so or not, we protest against making over these lands to the monopolists to the permanent exclusion of our own people

¹ Bill since stopped.

here at home. What on earth is the good of taking securities against the prohibition of immigration by the local authorities if you assign in advance all the available lands in the colony? For ourselves, looking at the prospect which is before the old country, already overburdened with a rapidly increasing population, we are not prepared to accept the policy of "Australia for the Australians" to which the Colonial Minister gives such ready and reckless sanction.

The controversy on the Royal Grants is now an old story. It was in effect settled on the lines laid down in the Select Committee by Mr. Gladstone. After much communication with Windsor, Mr. Smith was able to tell the Committee that Her Majesty, whilst holding that precedent gave her a claim upon Parliament to provide for every member of the Royal Family without exception, was willing to waive her rights save as regarded the family of the Heir Apparent. Mr. Gladstone thought that these rights, being founded mainly on precedents which were anterior to the last settlement of the Civil List, were not satisfactorily established, but, as they were largely waived, he was not prepared to enter upon a barren conflict concerning them; and, to get rid of all further applications whatever during this reign, he proposed to create a trust fund out of which the Prince of Wales should himself provide for his children. The Government fell in with this notion—although they had previously proposed to give annuities to all the children of the Prince—and fixed the sum at £40,000 a year. Mr. Gladstone cut this down to £36,000 a year, and again the Government agreed. But whilst Mr. Gladstone had the support of Sir H. Vivian and of Messrs. Parnell and Sexton, the Radicals, headed by Mr. John Morley, who had made their assent to the trust fund conditional upon an absolute waiver of all further claims of any kind, held that this condition was not satisfied. Accordingly they voted against it, with Messrs. Labouchere and Burt, who from the first had taken up an attitude of uncompromising hostility to any grants whatever for the third generation of the Royal Family. This division of opinion reappeared of course in the House of Commons. When it was proposed to go into Committee to consider the Queen's Message asking for provision for Prince Albert Victor and Princess Louise of Wales, Mr. Labouchere moved an amendment declaring that the funds granted to the Royal Family "were adequate without further demands upon the tax payers." Mr. Gladstone is never wanting in courage, and, with a full knowledge that he was in conflict with the vast majority of his immediate followers, he gave the Government an energetic support. His speech has been abundantly praised by Tories and by Liberals, and at this distance of time one need only point out that he affirmed with great emphasis that the Queen's waiver put an end to all further applications from the Crown during the present reign just as certainly as if the House had a formal contract signed, sealed, and delivered. Mr. Morley

thought the amendment somewhat wanting in courtesy and could not vote for it, but he intimated that at a later stage he would himself move another so as to raise the whole question afresh. Meantime he affirmed, in opposition to Mr. Gladstone, that there was no finality in the scheme before the House. The debate went over to the next night, when there was an amusing encounter between Lord R. Churchill and Mr. Bradlaugh, and ultimately the amendment was rejected by 398 to 116 votes.

The House having gone into Committee, Mr. Morley moved that no adequate grounds had been shown for the proposal, and that it was objectionable as leaving room for future claims of the same character. We must confess to a feeling of disappointment with this speech. The want of finality in the Government scheme was not sufficiently demonstrated in face of the Royal promise. To quote the unauthorized suggestion of a newspaper that the annuity of the late Duke of Albany should be revived for the benefit of his son was hardly to the point. Apart from this, Mr. Morley did not tell us how he would bind future Tory Parliaments, if such should hereafter be found at Westminster. To talk, indeed, of "finality" in this relation was somewhat misleading. It is possible Mr. Morley did not care to translate his thoughts into words, and there is no doubt one contingency—about which it is not permissible to speak more plainly—which is not covered by the Queen's waiver. This, however, is hardly in the same category with the claims under consideration. Thus Mr. Morley gave Mr. Chamberlain a chance of wiping off a few old scores, of which the Member for Birmingham very promptly availed himself. Mr. Chamberlain was so pleased with the result of his performance, that, as he proceeded, he grew ridiculously extravagant, and he finally wound up by calling the Radicals, who had opposed the grants, the Nihilists of English politics. It was unfortunate for him that his brother—the Member for Islington—had been among the minority in the previous division. Sir William Harcourt made effective use of the fact in reply. As to the degeneracy of the New Radicalism, upon which Mr. Chamberlain had expended many sarcasms, Sir William quoted Lord J. Russell: "There is something more sickening than the cant of New Radicalism, and that is the recant of Old Radicalism." Mr. Morley was fully avenged. The vote was very significant, since the amendment got as many as 134 supporters. It is amazing to note the growth of public feeling against these grants. When the last grant was made, the opposition counted just 13 votes. In the present case Mr. Parnell and his friends went in a body with Mr. Gladstone, so that the minority consisted of the back-bone of the Liberal party. This demonstration will not be lost upon the Court. If we had not the Queen's waiver, it would make all further appeal to Parliament impossible, and perhaps this reflection will be some

compensation to Mr. Morley for the effort which he made in the performance of what must have been an ungracious and repugnant task. For ourselves we willingly throw in the trust fund annuity, for the belief which we have that an indefensible system is now at an end. The report of the Select Committee recommends that, with regard to the daughters and younger sons of future sovereigns, arrangements should be made at the proper time—i.e., at the accession of a new sovereign—under which no future claim for provision from Parliament can arise. It is presumed, of course, that, as a consequence of the creation of the trust fund, the Prince of Wales made a settlement upon his daughter upon her marriage with Lord Fife. The young lady has at any rate not married without a dowry, since her wedding presents have been calculated to be worth nearly £200,000!

It is possible for once to leave out of view the condition of Ireland, or at any rate to dismiss it in a few words. The appeal made on behalf of Mr. Conybeare failed, although the Lord Chief Baron—the finest lawyer in Ireland—declared that in his opinion the hon. member was entitled to be discharged. In the case of Dr. Tanner, who was sentenced to a month's imprisonment for spitting upon an inspector of police, and to three months' (in default of giving sureties) for contempt of court, the Court of Exchequer quashed the first conviction on technical grounds, and the Lord Chief Baron expressed regret that they could not go into the merits of the case of contempt. The magistrates had power to hold the defendant to bail, and, in default of giving bail, to keep him in prison. The use of an old Edwardian statute against Dr. Tanner has given great offence. Under the Petty Sessions Act he might have been summarily committed for any term up to seven days; but the justices, knowing full well that he would not give bail, took advantage of a comparatively obsolete statute to keep him in prison for three months. It is not surprising that they have been accused of vindictiveness. It is one of the anomalies of the law that Dr. Tanner remains in prison for an offence committed when it is clear that he was not properly within the jurisdiction of the court. Much is said about the health of Mr. Conybeare, who is in Derry Gaol. He has told his Cornish friends that he suffers so severely from rheumatism and lumbago that at times he loses the use of his limbs, and especially he complains of the attacks of disgusting and loathsome vermin. Two of the Falcarragh prisoners died immediately on release from the gaol, and, as it is alleged, from typhoid fever. Hence there is a natural anxiety concerning the Member for Camborne. Mr. Balfour is, however, quite satisfied to know from the Prisons Board that there is no ground for complaint about the state of the prison.

Lord Randolph Churchill has been on a political tour in the Black Country, and has told the Tories of Central Birmingham that, if they

want him to fight their battle at the next election, he is at their service. He has learnt a lesson, and will not seek advice from anybody. This is a notice to Mr. J. A. Bright to quit. Mr. Chamberlain declares that the Unionists will support Mr. Bright, but the Gladstonians and the Tories together are overwhelmingly powerful, and Mr. Bright must be defeated in any contest with the Member for Paddington. Lord Randolph took occasion at Birmingham to lay down an elaborate domestic policy, in which he pleaded for a generous treatment of Irish claims. He would advance a hundred millions sterling for land purchase, and in the matter of local government would give everything short of an Irish Parliament and separate Executive. He warns the Tories that there is an awkward look about recent elections, and persistence in their present line will surely work them ruin. As to the Liberal-Unionists, they must "fuse" or perish. Mr. Chamberlain makes fun of all this in an uneasy sort of way, and then tells us that the Liberal-Unionists and the Government are in perfect agreement about the work of next session, which is to include both a Land Purchase Bill for Ireland and a Local Government Bill, the latter of which is to place Ireland practically, at all events, in the position of England and of Scotland. This, if true, is the best news we have heard for some time.

The visit of the young German Emperor was of more interest to the Continent than to ourselves. The "young man," to use the Pope's phrase, was particularly amiable, and charmed every one with whom he came in contact. The squadrons of the Fleet, gathered together at Portsmouth prior to starting for the naval manœuvres, must have been very much to his fancy, and he was so impressed by them that, at a dinner given by the Royal Yacht Club, he coupled the British fleet and the German army as the great factors in maintaining the peace of the world. At Aldershot he saw the sister service in all its arms, and he was especially complimentary on the general improvement which he thought had taken place since the Jubilee year in the bearing, drill, and equipment of the Volunteers. We are told that, coming from such a quarter, these views are matter for great congratulation.

The trial of Mrs. Maybrick for poisoning her husband—a Liverpool cotton-broker—has been the chief social excitement of the month. Few persons seem to have expected a conviction, and there was a great hubbub when she was condemned. The Judge (Mr. Justice Stephen) was hooted by the Liverpool mob, and both he and the jury were virulently assailed by other people who ought to have known better. The case was one of the gravest possible suspicion, but the differences of the medical experts as to the cause of death, and the fact that the deceased man was an arsenic eater, and had arsenic in various forms in his house, are enough, in the absence of direct proof of the administration of the poison, to make one hesitate

about inflicting the death penalty. At the time of writing the question of a reprieve is still undecided, but it is quite unlikely that the execution will take place.¹ Mr. Justice Stephen permitted Mrs. Maybrick to read a statement from the dock. The result was serious for the prisoner, and shows that the practice, which has been much advocated by law reformers, who wish to take the remaining "savagery" out of our criminal code, may have quite unexpected consequences. On the other hand, the question of establishing a Court of Criminal Appeal has been revived by this case. Lord Esher has the strongest opinion that such a court is necessary, and he has his plan all ready; but it must also be said that Lord Bramwell is equally convinced in the other direction, and he tells us that Mr. Poland, Q.C., the most experienced criminal lawyer in England, is with him.

The Special Commission did not long survive the withdrawal of the counsel for the Irish party. Mr. Parnell, being recalled to speak to the accounts of the League, point-blank refused to discover to the Court the nature and extent of the party funds. Sir James Hannen asked if he had any objection to give authority for the examination of certain bonds deposited in Paris, and he replied that he would certainly give no such authority. With this the evidence came to an end. Sir Henry James is to sum up for the *Times* after the Long Vacation, and, unless the Commissioners call further evidence on their own account, they will probably at once adjourn to consider their report, and the Court will close.

During the month Mr. Gladstone has kept his golden wedding, and his ancient friend, Lord Tennyson, who is not quite six months older, has celebrated his eightieth birthday.

¹ The sentence has been commuted to penal servitude for life.

LIBERALISM PHILOSOPHICALLY CONSIDERED.

THE question, in what does true Liberalism consist? is one upon which thousands of minds have been, and are still, at work. The split in the old Liberal party caused, or immediately occasioned, by the Home Rule conflict, has rendered it more than ever necessary to define principles and establish standards by which the claims of individuals or parties to the distinction of Liberals may be tested. Yet the confusion of thought which pervades most contemporary utterances on the subject, whether from the platform or through the press, is worse, if possible, than it ever was. It seems desirable, before propounding the view or views which form the main subject of this article, just to glance briefly at some of the current theories referred to. These may be roughly classed under three categories—the historical, the etymological, and the politico-empirical. According to the first, the Liberal party is the direct descendant of the old Whig party, consequently Liberalism and Liberal ideas are, or ought to be, deducible by evolutionary descent from Whiggism. This is not a case of *ignotum ab ignotiori*, for the Whig party, having completed its course as such, affords tolerably substantial data in the way of actions and results from which to infer their causes or motive principles. It started its career as the party of the English Revolution and the Protestant monarchy, supported by the middle classes and the great Protestant families among the aristocracy. It remained, during the whole of its existence, the champion of commercial and manufacturing interests; and it was chiefly on the religious side that its policy became modified in the direction of greater toleration and justice.¹ But in supporting the Reform Bill of 1832, the Whigs prepared their own dethronement. Henceforward, middle-class preponderance as a governing power being completely achieved, Whiggism ceased to have any *raison d'être* except as a conservative force within the Liberal party, and a check to Tory and “feudalistic” reaction outside it. The traditional opposition of the old Whig families to Toryism has secured their support in both Houses of

¹ Mr. Gladstone has recently called attention to the fact that the general Irish policy of the Whigs, as represented by Fox, Fitzwilliam, and others, was not merely tolerant, but of a distinctly “advanced” character.

Parliament to many of the measures initiated by their political successors, the Liberals and Radicals; but for the most part this support has been dearly paid for in the numerous compromises on important details which the latter have been forced to accept in order to retain it. At last, to the great ultimate advantage of the representatives of modern Liberalism, the Whigs have relieved them of their somewhat irksome company—once and for all it is to be hoped. Whig tradition can, therefore, no longer be fairly appealed to as the *fons et origo* of true Liberal policy.

Again, according to the etymological definitionists, the principles of Liberalism are to be determined by the original meaning of the word *Liberal* as applied to political views. There is not quite so much certainty as to the consequence of this method of definition as in the case of the historical. Thus the term seems to have been employed in somewhat different senses in England and in France. In the latter it connoted above all things political freedom and freedom of thought—*Liberté, Libre Pensée*. Mr. Henry George, in the course of a recent speech made by him in London, also attributed this sense to it. In England it is more commonly understood in the sense akin to *generosity*, and this, no doubt, was the first sense in which it was applied here. A Liberal, politically, was a member of the governing class who desired to see the privileges of his class more widely shared by those beneath him in the political and economic scale. Similarly, a Conservative was one who wished to maintain, or *conserve*, these privileges for his own class, and keep all other classes “in their proper stations.” With such aims and objects, it was a matter of course that the Liberal should be more ready to modify the political constitution which had become the bulwark of these class privileges. According to this derivation it is obvious that, as party names, the terms Liberal and Conservative become logically inapplicable to communities enjoying universal suffrage, where *all classes* are assumed to be, even if they are not practically, “governing” classes. For Liberalism, or Political Liberty (on this interpretation), becomes superfluous as soon as its supposed objects possess the right and power to help themselves to such privileges as Liberals would accord to them. For the same reason Liberal in this sense is a meaningless term—unless “by reflection”—when applied to adherents of the party drawn from a politically destitute class. They have nothing of their own to be liberal with.

According to the third, the politico-empirical or cart-before-the-horse school of definitionists, Liberal principles are best sought for at the bottom of the Liberal programme. From this point of view we must look to the measures, or groups of measures, proposed by the various leaders and organizations or “caucuses” of the Liberal-Radical party, since they usurped the functions of the old Whig statesmen. Thus a Liberal may be variously defined, after this

method, as an advocate of a Home Rule policy with regard to Ireland, coupled with "Peace, Retrenchment, and Reform" in our home and foreign affairs generally. Or, again, as a believer in a wide programme of political and social equalization, including "three acres and a cow" for each horny-handed son of toil, or—according to Lord Compton's corresponding urban bill of fare—"three rooms and a cat," together with Universal Enfranchisement, drawing the line only at Coolies and monkeys: Or, finally, your modern Liberal may be defined as a votary of the Free Breakfast Table, Free Schools, Liberationism, Free Marriage and Divorce, and Anti-Vaccinationism—of liberty, in fact, in all things, tempered only by wholesome restrictions, inserted at the instance of Sir Wilfrid Lawson, against getting drunk on the Sabbath. This rule-of-thumb method of representing Liberalism is, perhaps, the most common of all.

Mr. Jacob Bright, in a contribution to Mr. Andrew Reid's "New Liberal Programme," approaches a little nearer to the true mark of Liberalism. Paraphrasing a very old watchword, he says: "The broad distinguishing principle of the Liberal Party is government of the People by the People—the government of the people by their own consent."¹

None of these definitions and derivations is quite satisfactory. They merely skim the surface of the matter, reposing as they do upon phenomena rather than upon causant forces, upon outward and transient projections of mind rather than upon its inner substance, upon the ephemeral rather than upon the permanent. Nor can it be said that any of them, or indeed any other theory of the meaning of Liberalism, has been accepted as authoritative by the party itself. This chaotic or unformed condition of the subject emboldens the present writer to step into the arena, hoping at least in doing so to escape being classed among those too presumptuous individuals who step in where angels fear to tread.

The following may be described as the philosophic and scientific view of the question. It applies equally to the Liberalism of all ages and of all nations, under whatsoever name it has been known. Thus, for the short time during which the Whig party represented the most progressive and the most spiritually and intellectually expansive elements of the nation, it includes within its scope the policy and tendencies of that party, although by no means all the utterances of its mouth-pieces. With similar limitations, it applies to the Radicalism of the Cobbett school, and, later on, to the "Christian Socialism" of Kingsley and Maurice; it also applies to all that was true and generous, not merely self-seeking and interested, in the

¹ It may be noted here that it is quite the exception to find the term *People* used in its full and proper sense by politicians, as here. Its usual value, in the speeches or writings of public men of all parties, is simply "our own good followers."

Cobden school. It applies alike to the noble and spiritual democracy advocated by Lamennais, and in later times by Joseph Mazzini and his school; to the humane, albeit Utopian, communism of Robert Owen, and to what we may describe as the theosophic anarchism now being preached and exemplified by Count Leon Tolstói. On the other hand, this view of Liberalism does *not* include either the Gradgrind school of middle-class politicians, or those impatient physical-force Socialists, whose aim it is to precipitate a revolutionary conflict between the propertied and the unpropertied classes. Nor does it apply to those self-styled Liberals who help on the ship of Progress so long as she moves slowly through the narrow waters of party intrigue and family interests, but desert her as soon as she sails out into the mighty ocean of Justice and Faith.

In defining Liberalism according to the following view its opposite, Conservatism, must be, and is, equally defined. Briefly, then, the view or solution which is now submitted is that Liberalism and Conservatism in the abstract represent no mere professions of political belief, still less any definite groups of measures—although of course such shibboleths and such measures are the temporary signs or labels of each party—but represent, rather, two opposite poles of thought. Liberalism is a faith or attitude of the mind rather than a creed, a point of *view* rather than a point of departure. Conservatism is its opposite or, in some aspects, its negative merely. Liberalism is the *positive*, the *expansive* force in politics; Conservatism the dead or resistant force, the *vis inertia*.

Lord Randolph Churchill once gave unconscious expression to half of this truth when he proclaimed that Mr. Gladstone—*i.e.*, the Liberals—legislated by “intuition,” while his own party legislated by “fact.” He was, or believed himself to be, a staunch Conservative at that time.

All human minds, above the barbaric stages of development, contain in varying proportions a compound of these two opposed elementary forces—the Liberal, or progressive and expansive, and the Conservative, or inert and resistant. In certain individuals the one or the other consciously predominates, thus determining their “politics.” In others the predominance of either force is uncertain, until some sudden crisis reveals it. Parties and party programmes, or even “principles” (in the usual and narrow application of this word), must be regarded as the creatures, not the creators, of these two inherent *isms*.¹

A less transcendent and philosophic, but to some minds more easily apprehended aspect of their relations, may be described by saying that Liberalism is the political force which tends towards the con-

¹ This, by the way, is a suffix employed in quite a bewildering variety of senses, in the numerous terms into whose etymological composition it enters. A comparison of its significance in the following, as well as those now under review, will suffice to illustrate this variety: *sophism*, *mannerism*, *communism*, *euphemism*, *arianism*.

solidation of human interests, Conservatism that which maintains individual, class, or national insulation. Conservatives are the truest *Separatists*, so far as it is possible for men to keep asunder that which a higher power has joined together. Liberalism affirms the essential or underlying *solidarity* of human interests,¹ and the relativity and interdependence of all class or individual privileges, and of all "rights." The true Liberal, indeed, denies the existence of such rights without corresponding duties, or of duties without corresponding rights. Liberalism continually aspires towards, and works for, a more complete realization in form of this solidarity and this interdependence of rights and duties. Conservatism, on the other hand, affirms and endeavours to maintain the reality and permanence of the false barriers which stand in the way of their realization.

Again, Liberalism affirms the reality and the eternal force of principles, otherwise of divine laws; consequently the non-permanence or ephemeral and tentative character of all human laws. Conservatism, on the other hand, denies all law beyond and above that which is written or established by custom, affirming the reality and permanence of this latter. The watchword of Liberalism should be, "The (dead) letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life," that of Conservatism, "The letter is all that we have or need; of the spirit we neither know, nor care to know, anything."

To the Conservative mind, accordingly, all human laws and customs in vogue for the time being are "sacred," and should be treated as *absolute and irrevocable*. Liberalism, on the other hand, seeks through its legislation, by its personal examples, and in the education of its rising generation, to give form and expression to as much of that eternal (and therefore true) law and order as it is capable, for the time being, of discerning and aspiring towards. The "Veil of Maya," to borrow an expressive Indian metaphor, is lifted fold by fold as the intellectual and spiritual evolution of our race progresses; and it is the Liberal who, at each fresh uplifting, obtains the first view of the enlarged and ever-expanding horizon of human progress. Thus inspired, the Liberal of each succeeding age strives to adapt the material and temporary, that is, human, laws and customs—ay, even human comforts—to the spiritual and eternal. Under his active hands, as a conscious and willing agent of the great unseen evolutionary force of nature, these laws and customs develop and expand, as buds expand into blossoms. Each of them, indeed, is destined to wither away in its turn, giving place to the green fruit, and finally—after the periods of maturity and decay—to the seeds of a new civilization. For no progress is abso-

¹ Not of course necessarily implying political union in a particular sense, or even political union at all. The best friends in the higher, spiritual sense are by no means always those who are tied together by political, economic, or other material bonds—especially if that has been done against their wills.

lute and permanent in its material manifestations; there are cyclic laws of periodicity in the human no less than in the humbler realms of nature. Progress is simply the active force of the main current of evolution, as distinguished from its reactionary back-currents; and Liberalism is its prophet.

The only "order," as we have said, recognized by Conservatism is such as is based upon written law, and dependent upon a visible arrangement of things—visible, that is, to eyes trained in ignorance and the prejudice resulting therefrom. Where the Liberal administrator would rely upon the moral forces of love and justice, the Conservative demands Coercion Acts, police proclamations, the sword, and the baton.¹ The same difference is seen in regard to the foreign relations of one country with another. National honour, national *prestige*, are words obtaining two very different constructions according as they are pronounced by Liberal, or by Conservative or "Jingo"-Liberal mouths. True *prestige*, as understood by the one, is based upon well-sustained righteousness of conduct, upon justice, charity, patience, and a wise discrimination. False, or Conservative *prestige*, is based upon pretentious display, bluster, and cunning. The strength of the first is moral, and therefore substantial; it is what the true Liberal covets, above all things, for his country and for his party. The strength of the second is purely physical, and therefore liable to decay and dissolution, producing ultimate confusion and humiliation for its votaries. The Tory and the Jingo delight in it, very much as children delight in a noisy toy. But the end thereof is vanity.

That ever-surging, and increasingly troublesome question of the rights of property affords another illustration of the radical difference between Conservative and Liberal thought. The Liberal mind (*i.e.*, the mind in which the Liberal element predominates) views these rights, of course, as only relative and conditional, or subject to modification according to the exigencies of time and circumstance. The Liberal test is the national or collective expediency, as determined by the will of the people constitutionally expressed, and guided by that unwritten law, those undying principles, already referred to.² *Vox populi, vox dei*, was no mere poetic aphorism, but the expression of a truth—better apprehended, perhaps, by the ancients than by either modern Christians or modern Utilitarians and Materialists.

With Conservatives, and for that matter with Whigs and Liberals of the old-fashioned "Manchester" type (who have long since lost

¹ Mr. John Morley aptly described the law-and-order policy of Dublin Castle as being marked by the complete absence of the "*spirit of legality*."

² In his famous peroration to the speech introducing the Home Rule Bill, Mr. Gladstone said, "Let us endeavour to rely less upon merely written stipulations, and more upon those truer stipulations implanted in the heart and mind of man. Let us keep in mind the lesson which centuries and generations of men have taught us—not as a myth or mere theory, but as practice and as life—that the surest foundations upon which to build are those afforded by the affections, the convictions, and the will of the People. For it is thus, and thus only, by fulfilling the will of the Almighty, that we are able to secure the stability, the honour, and the welfare of the Empire."

touch with the Liberal Democracy), the true party shibboleth is "Property, property." It is only in dealing with the property of the nation that they are inclined to be *liberal*; to the advantage, or supposed advantage, of the classes whom they represent—that is to say, of those who are "in the swim" with them. The property of the individual (unless politically too humble and insignificant for Conservatism to respect) is so very sacrosanct that it must not be violated even in the interests of the whole nation, without compensation on a magnificent scale. But the nation in its collective capacity may be taxed and bled as much as it will stand for the benefit of favoured individuals or classes—say of absentee rack-renting landlords who have killed their Golden Goose, and are suffering the natural consequences of their follies and cruelties. It need not be assumed, of course, that "the rights of property" as embodied in written law conflict necessarily with Liberal principles. If properly and seasonably adjusted—*i.e.*, as the development of circumstances demand—they need never so conflict. But when through neglect or class selfishness this conflict has once declared itself—as it has done unmistakably in the instance above alluded to—then the attitude and action of individuals in regard to it become an excellent test of their respective claims to the distinction of Liberals.¹

The old *laissez-faire*, "devil-take-the-hindmost," Individualism of the extreme Manchester school is, of course, entirely opposed to the spirit of true Liberalism. The chief modern champions of Individualism within the ranks of the Liberal-Radical party, such as Mr. Charles Bradlaugh and Mr. Auberon Herbert, may fairly be acquitted of any such illiberal doctrines. If not, their life and actions belie their creed. Their Individualism (the Spencerian Individualism as it should be labelled) has more affinity to philosophic Anarchism than to the cult which our German neighbours have christened "Manchesterismus."

Liberalism does not, then, preclude a certain superstitious weakness for the rights of individual property. All the same, in its present historic phase, its tendencies are decidedly Collectivist; that is to say, the Liberal mind, reviewing society in Europe and America as it now is, and grasping the economic situation more thoroughly than it has done heretofore, favours collectivist rather than individualist solutions of the various social problems which press for its attention. As the *Pall Mall Gazette* has been pointing out recently, a great deal of the Social-Democratic programme is being imported into the independent manifestoes of certain advanced Liberals. Soon, no doubt, it will filter through into the official programme of the party. The Radicalism of the day is distinctly social-collectivist.

¹ Compare Gladstone on "golden moments and opportunities in history" in the speech referred to in the last note.

These considerations bring us naturally to the position and relations of Liberalism, as here defined, to the movement known as modern Socialism. Speaking generally, we may say, perhaps, that they are those of genus and species. Liberalism, the greater term, includes Socialism the less, or rather all that is true, righteous, and permanent in the various ideals comprised under that somewhat vaguely applied designation.¹ Contemporary Liberal-Radical politics are being permeated and coloured by Social Radicalism of the Collectivist type, very much in the same way as the old Whig-Liberal politics became permeated by, and finally saturated with, political Radicalism of the Jacobin type. The Liberal party is resigning itself quite contentedly to an educational course of Socialism, as evidenced by Sir William Harcourt's oft-quoted jest in earnest, "We are all Socialists now." Evolutionary, as distinguished from Revolutionary, Socialism is already an article of faith with many Liberals. On the other hand, much that goes by the name of Socialism, although paraded with all the humanitarian phraseology of Liberalism, is really quite foreign to it, being associated with actions and proposals animated by a positively anti-Liberal spirit. The Socialism of Mr. William Morris and his International Revolutionary "comrades" must be included under this category; still more decidedly must that of the French Blanquists and of the Anarchists, Mdle. Louise Michel, Prince Peter Kropotkine, Mrs. Parsons (who has lately been treating her London sympathizers to a series of violent harangues), and other stormy petrels of the same feather. If it be true that imitation is the sincerest flattery, then all these people, preaching as they do the gospel of "rights" in place of that of duties with reciprocal rights, and inflaming class-hatreds with threats of physical violence, are complimenting the Tories with a vengeance. All, indeed, who advocate the use of force in the offensive, as a political weapon, however contingently and prospectively they may do so, and however excellent their professed ends may be, fall under the same ban. Most of them, fortunately, repudiate the title of Liberals (which their consciences must tell them is too good for them), so that we shall not even offend their susceptibilities by excluding them from all claim to it.

It is the Conservative element among "the exploiting classes" (as our Socialist friends christen all those who are neither working men nor orators, and happen at the same time to disagree with their policy), and not the Liberal or Radical, that is playing into the hands of these intemperate revolutionists. The Liberal plan is to afford a free vent, even for the most imaginary grievances or the

¹ Socialism is treated, for the purpose of this comparison, as a particular attitude of mind and tendency of political action and aspiration. It must be admitted that it is rather more frequently applied to a set of more or less definite doctrines and practical proposals. Its sectarian divisions, Economic Collectivism, Communism, and Communistic-Anarchism, &c., are applied in still more contracted senses.

most visionary schemes of social beatification, in the full assurance that whatever is false in the cries of agitators will thus be exploded before it can gather volume, while that which is true will work its way up to the top, after being purged of all crudities, carefully digested, and finally assimilated by the Liberal party itself. The time-honoured Conservative method is the exact contrary to this—namely, to sit down on the safety-valves, and trust to the dead-weight of class prejudices, backed up by all the king's horses and all the king's men, blue coats and red, to “keep down sedition.” Not to mention instances much nearer home, this contrast of method is well illustrated by the treatment of the native press in India respectively advocated by Liberals and Conservatives. It is noteworthy that the Tory always expects moderation and patience on the part of his opponents, the victims of class or national oppression, but displays very little of it himself. Conservatives blindly resist all Liberal efforts at renewal, or even timely repair, of the rickety social edifice, preferring to plaster up ugly cracks with manufactured effusions of loyalty, and with smooth prophecies in class organs and at Primrose meetings or their Continental equivalents. Finally, if its baneful supremacy only lasts long enough, it brings upon its head the natural and inevitable catastrophe: the whole structure breaks down in a revolution, overwhelming in its ruins those infatuated classes who have relied upon the “firm” policy of their blind head-strong guides, but curse them now for crying, “Peace, peace, when there was no peace!”

The Liberal and Conservative attitudes in regard to popular demands were admirably summed up by Mr. Gladstone, when he defined the former as one of *trust* in the people tempered by *prudence*, and the latter as *distrust* modified by *fear*. Fear, we are rightly told, “is a bad counsellor.” It always implies hatred and anxiety to forestall—thus very often precipitating the peril dreaded from its object. Trust, on the contrary, is but the natural complement of love and harmony, the divine qualities of which Liberalism is the political expression. For the Liberal mind, as we have already maintained in slightly different language, is that which perceives the inner harmony, the universal harmony, and strives to give outward effect to it.

There is now very little left to add on the main subject of this article—namely, the philosophic import of the term Liberalism. But the relations of Liberalism in the abstract to Liberalism in the concrete (that is to say, to the words, actions, and efforts of those who from time to time exemplify it most completely), and also the relation of both abstract and concrete Liberalism to the parties known in England and elsewhere under the name Liberal, or which under other names correspond with them; these objects seem to demand a little further illustration. This will best be obtained by considering some common Liberal *mistakes*.

The mistakes into which partisan Liberals are apt to fall may be broadly classed under two heads—viz., their *inconsistency* and their *insufficiency*. Let us take them in the order given. Liberal politicians, in the self-flattering spirit of partisan pride, are apt to forget, or perhaps neglect and disguise from themselves, the fact that as human beings they must have *some* Conservatism in their natures. This mistake they commit both on their individual and on their collective behalves. They affect, therefore, for themselves and for their party—for it is nothing but an affectation in reality—to be Liberal, *wholly* Liberal, and *nothing but* Liberal. Now this practice, although euphemistically described as “acting up to one’s ideals,” invariably leads its subject into a more or less false position. In his nervous, but foolish anxiety for consistency, he becomes in reality most inconsistent. For the love of consistency in externals—in *seeming* to the world’s eye—is one of the chief marks of Conservatism.¹

In these cases, then, of laboriously-cultivated consistency it is just the Conservative element of the Liberal in question which is to blame. Outwardly no man can be *more* Liberal than he has it in him to be, but he can be—and many are—*less*.²

With regard to the second class of Liberal mistakes—viz., insufficiency—it may be described as follows. The Liberal, viewing as “evil” everything which the Conservative views as “good” through failure to perceive the essential relativity of good and evil, falls into the regrettable mistake of imagining that in the great order of the universe there can be no use or meaning in the blindness, greed, and ignorance of Toryism. In his self-righteous indignation he is apt to lose patience with it and its instruments, and to imagine that the world could get on very well without them. Yet this is certainly a mistake; the grain cannot grow without the husk, nor can the honey be stored up without the wax. The Conservative has his place in the universal economy, determined for him as clearly as the Liberal has his; nay, the individual of Conservative persuasion who, without straining “consistency,” acts up to his supposed ideal honestly, is more truly performing his appointed functions than the “unco’ guid” Liberal. Many a Liberal in point of outward facts, such as consistency interpreted as above, or “unselfishness”—another most fallacious expression—possesses in spirit very little of true Liberalism. The converse may be maintained of many an

¹ Compare also the anxiety for “respectability” in matters of every-day life and conduct.

² Another little hypocrisy, cognate to the above, but common to members of both parties, which is worth while referring to in this connection, is the straining after impartiality. On this point Mr. Gladstone’s advice is very appropriate. In one of his Nottingham speeches the year before last, he said that although there was certainly a higher standpoint from which political questions might be considered, the partisan point of view was one which no honest politician need shrink from avowing. It will generally be found that those who are loudest in their professions of being above partisanship are in reality beneath it, being either too ignorant, too apathetic, or too selfish to appreciate the value of loyalty to a great cause.

honest Tory, many an honest Reactionist, many an honest Revolutionist. The work they have done may have been of a less noble order, just as the scavenger's work is less noble than the architect's, yet it has been better and more thoroughly executed. The Great Presiding Spirit of the universe, which judges and disposes of all things, credits such simpler mortals with a cleaner record, advances them, may be, to a higher place on the next promotion day, than some of their seemingly more progressive brethren of the Liberal camp. These have allowed love of the world, love of form, love of applause to creep into the place of conscience and usurp its directing functions in the performance of their parts.

Finally, Liberalism may be described as the way leading towards political emancipation, or, in other words, the political method which leads out of politics into religion in the truest and highest sense of that word. It is that spirit in the government of a people which is ever tending to promote in individuals, as in the various sections of society, a consciousness of their essential unity, a generous recognition of their mutual interdependence ; the realization, in short, of the underlying brotherhood of humanity.

WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE, GENTLEMAN.

It is the innocent delight of some writers, chiefly amateurs in newly started periodicals—which do not like to seem too new to start with—it is the innocent delight of these budding authors to discover that Shakespeare had a great dislike to his profession as an actor. Their authorities are not difficult to unearth—can be bought, we believe, for sixpence—and they consist of what are triumphantly declared to be the best authorities in the world, the words of the poet-actor himself. If any one wished to question the truth of this discovery, he might begin at the beginning, and inquire if the opinion a man gives on his own profession is inevitably trustworthy.

We may digress here to record the experiences of a youthful friend who desired to go on the stage, and, therefore, betook himself to the house of an actor of assured position. Roscius was discovered in his study, sitting C., with his son, a humble follower of his father's example, thoughtfully regarding a brown-papered MS. lying on a table. The object of the visit was soon disclosed, and A. found nothing but cold water thrown on his aspirations.

"An actor!" cried Roscius. "My dear Edward, the profession is going to the dogs. What with society noodles, and long runs, a man can scarcely get his foot on the boards legitimately, or, having planted it, can advance a yard before his grey hairs come. Bless me, no! An actor! Anything but that! Look at the life. We work when all the world is playing. Think of the monotony—one part in six months, a year, more perhaps. And after all, that's luck nowadays. Remember the poor wretches who go round the provinces, never get settled, poky lodgings, food cooked anyhow! And that's luck, too. Some can't get food at all! My dear Edward, I've too great a regard for you not to tell you the truth, and I only hope you will heed what I say, unlike my self-willed boy there."

The thoughtful youth raised his head.

"'Pon my soul, it's too bad. A couple of lengths in the new piece, after all my experience! Trent gets all the fat!"

"I am sure," exclaimed A. impulsively, "you could play his parts every bit as well as he does."

"Oh, my dear fellow, one has no chance against Trent. His hair curls divinely, don't you know? A man whose hair curls is a born tragedian."

"There are three things against an actor," said Roscius, otherwise Challoner, pensively smiling at his son's satire, and passing his hand slowly through still luxuriant locks; "three things, Edward—the dramatist, the company, and the critic. The dramatist is not always a Polished Person. Until one is in a position to dictate one must utter what may be personally distasteful. There is a reverse to the medal—of that the dramatist can speak for himself. But very frequently, when an actor is consciously coarse, it is because his dramatist has been unconsciously silly. He saves the play, and loses the artist. Then, secondly, all sorts and conditions of men are employed in the production of a play; one comes in contact with most, and an ignorant public places all on a level. I have seen a stage carpenter described in the police news as an 'actor.' The name is commonly applied to ballet girls and supers because they assume it themselves. Now, a man can produce a poem or a picture, and, no matter how many are concerned, they bear his name alone. Thirdly, there is the critic. Well, of course, every one is down on the critic. Mr. Frith's contemptuous denunciations are amusing reading enough, but actors suffer more than painters; for a critic of acting requires no knowledge of technical expressions, such as is necessary for critics of painting or music. The only chance for these is that the public is quite as ignorant as they often are. But what passes for dramatic criticism is a fearful and wonderful thing. Beaufort was told he 'did well' as Laertes, Lindley was a 'manly Horatio,' and Frank there was 'youthful and pleasant' as Osric. Of course he is youthful, any one can see that—hold your tongue, Frank!—and he is pleasant enough when not studying a new part. So, Edward, don't be in a hurry; just listen to me. I am intimate with Lewis Morton, the barrister, you know. I'll give you an introduction. Oh! you are acquainted. Of course. Go to him, I am certain the law is the very thing for you. Mention my name; he'll tell you what to do, and point out all the advantages of the profession. You'll go? Sensible lad. Come back, and let me hear how you get on."

A., willing to be convinced, but sceptical as to the possibility, left Roscius, and made for the chambers of Lewis Morton, reaching there as the famous barrister was about to lunch.

"Glad to see you. Sit down. I've actually got an hour to spare. What can I do for you, Ned?"

His mission was explained. The lawyer laughed.

"That's good, that is—good even for my old friend, and he was always a wag. Nature meant him for comedy, but society turned him out a tragedian. It's good for him to talk! When you're at the top of the tree, you're apt to eat the apples instead of throwing them down to the hungry ones below. You wanted some of his apples, eh? No wonder! There he is, rolling in riches got by

exercising the most delightful art in the world—a universal favourite, society at his feet, everything he does a success because he does it; why, he oughtn't to have a care in the world. A lawyer! Good heavens! be anything you like but a lawyer. It isn't only the weary waiting for briefs during your best years, but even when your briefs come in almost faster than you want them, why! what a life it is! I speak—for a change—the real truth to you, for your father's son is something to me, and I tell you, lad, if you will be a lawyer you must put in your pocket all that makes life honourable. The dirty things we do! not only the lowest of us either. Isn't a lawyer a synonym for dishonesty? And 'this wise world of ours is mainly right.' . . . But you must forget your Tennyson, Edward, forget you have a heart, forget that it is a man's duty to protect the fatherless, a man's privilege to respect the purity of women. You must put a modest girl out of countenance, wring tears from an outraged mother—at all costs (to get your costs) be true to your client, and false to your manhood."

" 'His honour rooted in dishonour stood,' " quoted A. softly.

"Yes, Ned, it is so. We wallow in mud from day to day, and it soils us!"

" 'And almost thence my nature is subdued
To what it works in, like the dyer's hand.' "

"That's true, too, you book of quotations! A lawyer—you! God bless me, look here, Edward. You know Sir Wilfred Brande? All right. Be off to him. His is a noble profession; see what he says, and follow his advice if you can."

A. was somewhat surprised at this conclusion, but decided to "see it out," and made an appointment with the Court physician.

"A doctor, Edward?" The keen face softened. "Ah, me! the innocence of you boys. You think it would be grand to be Medicine Jack to Royalty! We are not all Court physicians, either. What is common to all is a most harassing life—sleepless nights, weary days, frightful responsibility. I have known what it is to keep a family and an appearance—the latter costs the more—on next to nothing a year. Don't try it, Ned. And even my life now——" Sir Wilfred paused, and was silent for some minutes. "No words of mine, were I free to utter such words, could give you any idea of the envy and malice that dog the steps of a successful physician. And the dense ignorance, the besotted conservatism, of those who—there, I can't speak of it. Apart from this, the weight of responsibility, on one trusted as I am by those whose lives have a national value—well, no one's life is all roses, Edward, but without repining that heaven is not another Heligabalus, one might look for a far-off whiff of their perfume."

"But then—you see so much of good society, you——"

"Society! Why, the society you speak of is in the last stages of imbecility—and worse. It is founded on American money—and

manners,¹ and French morals. No! when the best of them want society—good society—they come to *us*; just as the worst of them, who want to marry money, go to America. The society of the higher professions is the only society worth having. I shouldn't like to be too confident, for ours is only a less snobbish nation than the Yankees, but I don't *think* we should sell our girls to men of infamous reputation, though they happened to bear an historical name; I don't *think* they should marry men who have had almost as many wives as Brigham Young; I don't *think* we should receive an emancipated washerwoman or glorified barbarian, because she chanced to possess more diamonds than the old woman in the shoe had children; and all these things does society do, and goes to Court withal. Leave this sort of society alone. I find no pleasure in it. Let me see. What do you say to the army? Suppose you went to Colonel Wolfe, and talked it over with him? No fancy for killing, eh? And you wanted to be a doctor! You would have had to get over that, you know. That, at least, is the thing to say; I never saw the humour of it myself. However, there are plenty of soldiers who don't have to kill anything but time. Wearisome?—perhaps it is, if you can't get excited over the shape of buttons and the size of epaulettes."

A. rose to go, when an idea struck him.

"But, Sir Wilfred, if you dislike your profession so much, why don't you——"

"Ah!" interrupted the physician, hurriedly, "of course one has compensations; it is a noble thing to relieve suffering and preserve valuable lives, and—and—oh! I have outrun my time. You must excuse me, Edward. I have a patient waiting for me—a most interesting case; only the second of its kind I have had during my whole career. Good-bye. Go and see Morton again. I am sure the law would suit you."

Sir Wilfred rushed off, and A., musing deeply, went on to Morton's, and found the barrister at home.

"Brande put you off, eh?"

A. explained, adding,

"And, I say, Mr. Morton, if you dislike the law so much, why don't you ——?"

"Bless me, the law does well enough for me! I'm used to it, hardened to it. It's a different thing for you, with all your youth before you. Besides, it's not all so bad; sometimes one can unravel a whole web of shameless plotting, and give the ill-doer his deserts—if he's on the other side. I've a brief just now from a man called Trott—most intricate; it is a case full of surprises, and I rather think I shall add a good deal to my reputation. Yes, I see my way to a telling peroration, and if I win over the jury it will be a feather in my cap, for every one thinks they will go against me. But we shall see!" Morton rubbed his hands.

¹ The speaker would mean, probably, that American culture is not represented.

"But you said——"

"To be sure! What was I saying? Bless me, I've not another moment. Run up to the Alexandra; you'll catch Challoner in his dressing-room. Tell him I say he is a fraud. Good-bye."

To the Alexandra A. bent his steps, or rather directed his hansom. The tragedian was dressing, but A. was admitted.

"Seen Morton yet?"

Once more A. explained, and continued,

"And, sir, if you also think so badly of your profession, why don't you——?"

"I? Oh, but that's another thing. I'm in it, you see; I couldn't do anything else now. Besides, to be honest—well, it's no small matter to open the eyes of thousands to the beauty and goodness and poetry existing amongst us. The world would soon be blind, were there no artists in it. Morton is half right; we actors may paint our faces, but we can keep our hands clean. And if one is born to be an actor, it is all right. It is those who mistake their vocation that sink."

"I think I understand you," said A. "May I read you a few lines I copied out into my note-book this morning?—they express your sentiments so well. 'Not in thy condition, but in thyself, lies the mean impediment over which thou canst not gain the mastery. What mortal in the world, if without inward calling he take up a trade, an art, or any mode of life, will not feel his situation miserable? But he who is born with capacities for any undertaking, finds in executing this the fairest portion of his being.'"

"Exactly," said Challoner, drumming lightly on the dressing-table. A. went on reading.

"'Thou dost well to wish thyself within the limits of a common station; for what states that required soul and resolution couldst thou rightly fill? Give a soldier, a statesman, a divine, thy sentiments, and as justly will he fret himself about the miseries of *his* condition.' That is what you would say, sir?" finished A., softly. He looked up, a little quizzically, and met the dark eyes of the actor fixed on him—eyes whose changeful depths now shadowed the sorrow of Hamlet, now laughed, like the sunshine, with Mercutio.

"You would never make an actor."

"Why, sir?"

"You are too clever. Our modern dramatists wouldn't know what to do with you, or how to write for you. There, I'm called. Come down to the wings while I go on."

Another minute or two, and they stood together at the wings; yet one more, and the actor drew himself up, and a deafening roar of welcome showed when he stepped upon the stage. As he silently bowed in response, a faint smile, imperceptible to the audience, played round the mobile lips, and the flashing dark eyes deepened in colour. A. marked this, stayed a moment to listen to the artist's

exquisite voice—a voice of that soft, yet deep, thrilling timbre, which strikes on a sensitive ear with all the lovely sadness inseparable from great beauty—and then passed into the street. A small city arab, with one eye on the oblivious policeman, solicited alms with the usual whine. A. extracted a silver coin, and, as he laid it in the wondering palm, said impressively—

“There you are, my lad; but mind this: don’t you crack up begging as a profession to your gentlemen friends. It’s all very well for *you*, so you—stick to it!”

Then A. jumped into a hansom. He has a farm in Australia now, and is doing well; but he doesn’t recommend farming to any one who applies for information.

This, ladies and gentlemen, is the extent of our digression.

It has been sought, then, to cast a slur on the profession of the stage by showing that its greatest poet, himself an actor, thought very badly of it. The proof lies in extracts from two Sonnets, which are as follows:—

“Alas! ’tis true, I have gone here and there,
And made myself a motley to the view;
Gored mine own thoughts, sold cheap what is most dear,
Made old offences of affections new.
Most true it is that I have looked on truth
Askance and strangely; but, by all above,
These blanches gave my heart another youth,
And worse essays proved thee my best of love.

Sonnet 110.

O, for my sake do you with fortune chide,
The guilty goddess of my harmful deeds,
That did not better for my life provide,
Than public means, which public manners breeds.
Thence comes it that my name receives a brand,
And almost thence my nature is subdued
To what it works in, like the dyer’s hand.

Sonnet 111.

For the defence of the stage we plead, in quasi-lawyer fashion: first, that Shakespeare did not write the libel; or, he did not write it *in propria persona*; or that, if he did, the words quoted do not refer exclusively to his profession as an actor; and, finally, that there were extenuating circumstances.

The Sonnets are supposed to have been written by Shakespeare, because of the internal evidence of style, expression, and so forth; also because Meres spoke in 1598 of Shakespeare’s “sugred sonnets among his private friends,” and two Sonnets were published in 1599 in *The Passionate Pilgrim*—a volume of poems bearing his name. Students of the Sonnets ascribed to Shakespeare must each decide for himself regarding the value of the “internal evidence,” and whether the adjective “sugred” well describes these poems;¹ and

¹ The poem, *Venus and Adonis* (1599), was described as consisting of “certaine amorous sonnets.” Perhaps Meres so used the word *sonnet*, and referred to trifling love-poems, never printed at all.

they must find a likely reason for only two of them being printed in *The Passionate Pilgrim* in 1599, when, from Meres' expression, it would seem that a considerable number were in circulation.

In Sonnet 138, one of the two published in 1599, when Shakespeare was thirty-five years old, he says—

“My days are past the best,”

and adds, after condemning the lady addressed as untruthful because she pretends to think him young,

“And wherefore say not I, that I am old.

O, love's best habit is in seeming trust,

And age in love, loves not to have years told.”

This is rather strange language for a man not thirty-five. In Sonnet 78, probably written still earlier, he says—

“That time of year thou may'st in me behold

When yellow leaves, or none, or few, do hang

Upon those boughs which shake against the cold,

Bare ruined choirs, where late the sweet birds sang.”

And much more to the same effect. Even in 1609, when all the Sonnets were published, Shakespeare was only forty-five: even then he would hardly have begged his “master-mistress” “to love that well which thou must leave ere long.”¹

If Shakespeare wrote the Sonnets we have to concede that he was not only faithless to his wife, but made the fact public, without shame, among “his private friends.” Why, then, rebuke his mistress for sins he could out-match?

But was this language used by Shakespeare at all? In 1599 Shakespeare's name was well known, and when *The Passionate Pilgrim* appeared in that year it contained many pieces that were not Shakespeare's; inserted under his name to give them spurious value, according to a common practice of the time. Possibly the two Sonnets were among the number falsely attributed to the popular author of *Romeo and Juliet* (printed 1597). If so, nothing but internal evidence remains to connect any of the Sonnets with Shakespeare's name. It is a strange fact that when the collection of Sonnets was published in 1609, containing the two printed in *The Passionate Pilgrim* in 1599, it was without Shakespeare's sanction, and at that time Shakespeare was trebly famous, and his name had infinitely more value than even in 1599.

These are the data that might lead us to consider the authorship of the Sonnets at least uncertain, if we could trust at all to external evidence.² Supposing, notwithstanding, that he wrote all the Sonnets, were they written *in propria persona*?

¹ Sonnet 78.

² Many of the Sonnets we could ill spare from Shakespeare's literary crown; others we would willingly pluck thence.

Against this we have first to remember the allusions to the *age* of the writer. Then, in the days of Shakespeare, it was no uncommon thing for authors to write what others were to use as their own. A gentleman ordered an ode to his mistress' eye-brow, on as business-like a principle as we order a new hat, or commission a new picture. The ode became as much his own as if he had penned it himself; it was presented as the heir of his invention, and received as such. The thing was common, and, as a rule, no one was more deceived than he or she wished to be. There may have been occasions when the purchaser became so enamoured of his bargain, that in time he was able to persuade himself it was indeed the rich product of his own brain; or that, at all events, it owed its chief beauties to his inspiration. If so, the delusion was of an order even now not absolutely extinct; therefore let us not cast a stone.

We cannot but observe, also, the contradictory statements in the Sonnets. In No. 70 the person addressed is innocent of sin, and so in many others, notably No. 105; while in Nos. 35 and 95 he is guilty; and in Nos. 36 and 111 it is Shakespeare who is in fault—so much so that he fears lest his “bewailed guilt” should do his friend shame. In No. 70 Shakespeare indignantly alludes to slanders affecting that friend, and declares him “either not assailed” by temptation, “or victor being charged;” in 112 the poet himself is slandered. The Sonnets, again, are not all in one form; and if at one moment their author looks upon them with contempt, at another he declares they will make their subject immortal. Therefore he evidently meant to give to the world poems making public disgraceful sins on the part of himself and his friend! The difficulty has naturally led to many adopting the theory that Shakespeare wrote to express the feelings of others, and Sonnets 110 and 111 have been supposed to give voice to the lamentations of the ex-favourite Southampton, whose follies and exile and ill-report vexed the heart of Elizabeth Vernon, his betrothed. Certainly, they were common talk at the time, while Shakespeare appears to have enjoyed a high reputation among his contemporaries, though there must have been many only too ready to make capital out of such dark doings as are shamelessly sung in the Sonnets. The presumption is that no one believed Shakespeare such a degraded being as to make them credible in connection with himself. They would observe that the friend of Southampton, while professing to find the young noble's love all-sufficing, could not bespatter the profession to which he owed his friend, or call himself an “outcast.” They would be aware that Shakespeare in his “sere and yellow leaf” held no “pupil-pen,” and feared no rival in poesy.

It is possible, then, that the “sugred Sonnets” were written for, and not to, Shakespeare's private friends—not, therefore, *in propria persona*. In that case it would be something of a relief to know

that the passionate youthfulness breathing through *Romeo and Juliet* was not quite lost in the aged lover of the bold, bad woman who was not beautiful; that Shakespeare did not write himself down unfaithful; and that he was not inspired by the sickliest sentiment for a "master-mistress."

Conceding, for the sake of argument, that Shakespeare in the Sonnets was expressing his own feelings, we have to take note of the circumstances under which Sonnets 110 and 111 were written.

It is true we have no proof that the Sonnets came from Shakespeare in the order in which they were printed, but it is equally true that a certain sort of story is developed in some of the poems, and the course of this would point to Nos. 110 and 111 being written earlier, not later, than Nos. 138 and 144. This would place their production prior to 1599.

Shakespeare went up to London about 1587. Thomas Greene, a relation probably of his own, had acted at Stratford, and very likely the performances had awakened in the youth a conviction of histrionic genius lying buried within him. It is a conviction that, secretly or openly, possesses not a few of us in the enlightened days of Queen Victoria; and it would not be strange if it obtained a strong hold of a youth living in the Elizabethan era. Shakespeare, therefore, after his arrival in town, was content to act small parts in the theatre, and to help patch-up plays for representation by its company. In 1592 he was contemptuously referred to by Robert Greene as a "*Johannes factotum*." Nevertheless, in the following year he dedicated his *Venus and Adonis*, and, a year later, his *Lucrece*, to the Earl of Southampton—the latter in terms of strong affection. It is to this noble, younger than Shakespeare by some ten years, much attached to the drama, and undoubtedly a patron of the poet, that the Sonnets are generally supposed to be inscribed. Sonnets 37, 124, and 125 seem to refer to the rank of the person addressed, and Sonnet 22 has the expression—

"How can I then be elder than thou art?"

In 1599 *The Passionate Pilgrim* made its appearance, being ascribed to Shakespeare, containing work that was not his, and including Sonnets 138 and 144. We have to conjecture that the Sonnets which preceded these in the pirated edition of 1609 were written before 1599, but not published. In No. 104 Shakespeare speaks of the "three beauteous springs" that have passed since he first saw the friend whom it apostrophizes. Supposing he made the acquaintance of Southampton in 1592, or earlier, and he were the inspirer of the Sonnets, this would place No. 104 in 1595, or earlier. In No. 82 the following lines occur:—

"I grant thou wert not married to my muse,
And therefore may'st without attaint o'erlook
The dedicated words which writers use
Of their fair subject, blessing every book."

This must surely have been written after the dedication of *Venus and Adonis* or *Lucrece*. As Shakespeare evidently ceased to address his male "love" for a time subsequent to the writing of Sonnet 99, it is possible that No. 82 was written between the two dedications, and the added warmth of the second accords with the expression in No. 102, where Shakespeare says—

"Our love was new, and then but in the spring,
When I was wont to greet it with my lays . .
. I sometime held my tongue,
Because I would not dull you with my song."

Now, up to 1595 we find Shakespeare playing inferior parts, patching up other men's work, possibly beginning to write some original plays—though of this we have no proof—and apparently deriving his main fortune from the patronage of a young nobleman, to whom he dedicates the only works appearing under his name, and whom, in a number of Sonnets, he is addressing in terms of extravagant and submissive admiration and affection. His humility extends at times to his poetry :

"For I am shamed by that which I bring forth,
And so should you, to love things nothing worth."

Sonnet 72.

If, under these circumstances, though we must then grant him something of a snob, perhaps something of a tuft-hunter, Shakespeare wrote Sonnets 110 and 111, his expressions would not be unnatural. (But we doubt if Southampton's friendship would be natural!) In his eagerness to prove himself worthy of his patron he would, being a snob, despise the necessity for working. Even in our own time, the phrase "to live by one's wits" has a sinister meaning; to live by one's wits in the days of Shakespeare was a thing beneath a gentleman. No gentleman possessed wits, any more than the Queen of Spain owned to legs. The middle classes were, as such, unknown, and all arts and professions were spurned by the proud nobility. Nowadays a gentleman may dabble in art or literature, may pose prettily on the stage, or even paint a picture; but the professional man still remains outside Society—with a capital—and belongs instead to the best society, that of real culture and brains. If he is of the right sort he by no means complains; he may satirize. In *Sant Ilario* Mr. Marion Crawford has the following passage:—"A man who has grown to years of discretion in the atmosphere of studios, or in the queer company from which most literary men have sprung, will inevitably, at one time or another, offend the susceptibilities of that

portion of humanity which calls itself Society. . . . Among a set of people whose profession it is to do always, and in all things, precisely what their neighbours do, the man who makes his living by doing what other people cannot do, must always be a marked figure. . . . But if he will hold his tongue in private, Society will give him a cup of tea, and treat him almost like a human being, for the sake of being said to patronize letters . . . but he will not succeed in marrying any of Society's sisters, cousins, or aunts without a severe struggle." Sometimes the modern "professional" rounds on the enemy, as does "Edna Lyall" in *Derrick Vaughan, Novelist*. "What right have you to look down on one of the greatest weapons of the day? Why is a writer to submit to scoffs and insults, and tamely to hear his profession reviled?" Why? Well, perhaps, because the noblest Worker of all was reviled in His profession of Preacher and Healer, and "answered not again."

Thackeray has many a sneer at the low opinion which his contemporaries held of the followers of literature; there was a time when lords of high degree considered their chaplains to be suitable husbands for cast-off mistresses, and caused them to retire before dessert. Miss Austen tells us something of the position of the country clergy, even as late as her day. To follow an art was, long after Shakespeare's time, to drop low in the social scale, and artists, whether in literature, or on the stage, with the chisel or the brush, were usually of mean birth, and obtained little honour for their brains. Brains, indeed, were looked upon as a convenient commodity, to be bought, when required, by aristocratic purses, or, not infrequently, promises; but the seller was a low fellow, and waited patiently in my lord's ante-chamber, or sent begging letters from Grub Street. Some few were clever enough to make good use of their patrons, and rise to independence, and, though Spenser died in poverty, Shakespeare was wiser, and lived to write "Gentleman" after his name. He it was, *perhaps*, who, mindful whom he addressed, lamented in his Sonnets that God had given him these same despised brains, by means of which he nevertheless meant to rise. He professed to be grieved that he was a player, and able to sell his plays, while not able to refrain from expressing the opinion that he had not been paid according to his merits. Authors in the nineteenth century have been known to consider that they have "sold cheap" what, in their own estimation, was "most dear!" Shakespeare further regretted that he had looked strangely on truth, and done many "harmful deeds," and naturally asked his patron to believe that it was entirely because he was compelled—by poverty, we presume—to receive money from the public for his acting and his plays. We hope Southampton took the hint, and very likely he did. Yet, what could have been expected of the deer-stealing son of the worthy Stratford butcher but "harmful deeds," even if he had remained at home to

follow his father's harmless, necessary trade? "Tis in ourselves that we are thus and thus." Shakespeare complained elsewhere (Sonnets 112 and 90) of "vulgar scandal," and that the world was bent his "deeds to cross." Had Stratford tales come up to town, or did he refer to the envy and malice of fellow-dramatists, such as Robert Greene?

Now, to pass from the date assigned to Sonnets 110 and 111, and follow Shakespeare's fortunes a little further. Helped by Southampton, and having made something by "public means," he was, by 1596, the owner of a share in Blackfriars' Theatre. By his acting he could have made little; by his plays—even if he had written any original ones—probably less; but a powerful and liberal patron smoothed matters then as now. In this same year, 1596, John, Shakespeare's father, possibly not urged or unassisted by his son, applied for a coat of arms; in 1597 the poet bought New Place; in 1598 he had money to lend, and in 1599 *The Passionate Pilgrim* appeared, without his sanction. In 1602 he bought one hundred and seven acres in Old Stratford, and became William Shakespeare, Gentleman. In 1603 Elizabeth died, and Shakespeare wrote no ode in praise of the royal vestal dead, whom he had flattered, living, in his plays. Why not? Well, perhaps Shakespeare, being now a gentleman, had learned the whole duty of a courtier, and preferred to sing "Long live the King!" rather than mourn that "the Queen is dead!" If so, he lost nothing by his wordly wisdom. In 1603 King James arrived in London, and, wasting no time, the Lord Chamberlain's company of players, including Shakespeare—who may have had something to do with this wise haste—applied for and received a license from the King, and were from that time the "King's Players." The license was couched in agreeable language, and authorized the actors to freely exercise the "arte and faculty of playing" all manner of stage plays in "any convenient place." The King's mandate continued: "Willing and commanding you, and every of you, as you tender our pleasure, not only to permit and suffer them herein, without any your lets, hindrances, or molestations, during our said pleasure, but also to be aiding or assisting to them if any wrong be to them offered. And to allow them such former courtesies as hath been given to men of their place and quality: and also what further favour you shall show to these our servants for our sake, we shall take kindly at your hands." Could Victoria say more? Was not the royal author in advance of his age, and conscious of the brotherhood of art?

Under these circumstances, greatly changed from those of 1595—a popular dramatist; an acceptable actor in a company smiled on by the King; a man of property, calling himself a gentleman—was it not high time for him to give up the use of "public means" conducing to "harmful deeds," to lay down his pen, doff his motley,

raise his relations, retire to his domains, and cultivate the acquaintance of the resident gentry?

He did none of these things. He was an incorrigible Bohemian, who was to die in consequence of a drinking bout. He revised *Hamlet* in this same year, 1603, and in it paid a glowing tribute to his profession as an actor (was the courtly reception awarded to the actors of *Hamlet* a delicate acknowledgment of kingly favours?), gave his opinion of what constituted a good play, and did not neglect to put parlous long speeches into the mouth of the Ghost—the part he played himself. In this year, too, we know he acted in Ben Jonson's *Sejanus*, and we do not know but that he continued to play up to the time of his leaving London. In 1605 he bought more land, and in 1607 married his daughter Susanna to a distinguished physician. His brother Edmund, an actor also, died in this year. In 1609 appeared the pirated edition of the Sonnets. How significant is the fact that not then, nor at any time, did he acknowledge them publicly! Was he not a man in authority, and had he not put away childish things? What had he to do now, if he ever had, with dark bad women? Or what need had he to curry favour with, or fawn on, any man? If he wrote the Sonnets, perhaps he was ashamed of them. He had found "public means" a very good thing, and his verse, no longer to be classed with "things nothing worth," brought him in the money he knew how to use. He liked his wit-combats and his boon companions, and not till 1613, at the mature age of forty-nine—and men were shorter-lived then—did he retire finally to his country house.

How, then, can we imagine that Shakespeare, who remained on the stage till nearly fifty years old, long after he had attained a competence, and wrote plays till death o'ertook him, despised his profession? Nowhere in his works does he rail at it, or at what are called the "arts of imitation," as if man ever truly created anything! Among the crowd who await Lord Timon, with the jeweller and the merchant, are the poet and the painter; the poet is begged "Go not away;" the painter is saluted as "Gentleman," and bid to dine. Shakespeare seems to have earnestly desired all that could add honour to the stage. He was indignant that "art" should be "tongue-tied by authority" (Sonnet 66)—as it often was. He lamented that he had not the armies of Irving or Mansfield.

" May we cram
Within this wooden O the very casques
That did affright the air at Agincourt?"

He wanted—

" A kingdom for a stage, princes to act,
And monarchs to behold the swelling scene."

These passages we find in *Henry V.*, probably written in 1599, and published in 1600. There is no depreciation of the actor's or poet's

art there. The spectacle of Richard II. and Bolingbroke recalled to him a "well-graced actor." Had he, perchance, ever suffered from the eyes "idly bent on him who enters next?" He entertains kings and nobles with a play, as with choicest fare, and even his satire is kindly. Even Bottom's company of amateurs are drawn with a gentle hand. Their "simpleness and duty" command a king's respect.

In his will, Shakespeare left to three of his fellow-actors the wherewithal to buy them mourning rings. Could he have foreseen that to two of these he would owe most of his fame, and the world the richest gift it ever knew, what would have been their guerdon? Was he, in the vigour of ripe years, deferring till old age the gathering and collecting of his plays, knowing not that his day was at hand? However it was, in dowering us with this gift, Hemynge and Cundell made Shakespeare's triumphal arch, under which the nations gather to worship, their own eternal monument.

We must repeat, then, that this Shakespeare who, in the maturity of his power, in the zenith of his popularity and prosperity, revised the play which incidentally treated of acting as an art; remained a player and a writer of plays, and numbered his fellow-actors among his private friends; was no despiser of the art "far more delicate than music;"—more delicate because, as Goethe says, its professors "are called on to express the commonest and the strangest emotions of human nature, with elegance and so as to delight." Probably long before 1602 the poet had discovered that "William Shakespeare, Gentleman," was compatible with William Shakespeare, Actor and Dramatist. Or mayhap philosophy had taught him a retort—

"We live in peace, all envy chase,
And heed not which o' th' two surpasses,
I in the Herald's Books no place,
You having none about Parnassus."

CECIL W. FRANKLYN.

[NOTE.—An unknown William Hughes is thought by some to be the inspirer of certain sonnets. When Walter, Earl of Essex, lay dying in 1576, his musician, one William Hewes, played to him. Perchance Hewes had a little heir in the nursery, with his father's name and talent. Shakespeare was fond of music! And the wide eye of conjecture may roll, in divine frenzy, over the ample Shakespearian fields, without fearing any let or hindrance in the form of the dead wall of certainty.]

THE NATIONAL ADMINISTRATION OF THE LAND.

HAVING in a previous article¹ shown how, without anything that can be reasonably called spoliation, without any social or financial disturbance, but with great gain and social advantage, the land may be brought under the direct and unrestricted control of the nation, we now proceed to the second part of our scheme, the work of organization. Here also several preliminary questions present themselves, which must be settled before we can definitely determine the form of administration to be adopted. There are some persons who, for various reasons, cannot accept Land Nationalization, but would not object to Land Communization or Municipalization. Such persons apparently fail to perceive that these are but different phases or applications of one and the same principle, which may be thus stated in general terms:—That where a community has a common and inclusive interest in land, that land should be under the direct and unrestricted control of the community. From this it will be seen that the phase or name depends upon what the community is. In the case of an isolated village, having a common and exclusive interest in the land surrounding it, the Russian *mir* is an appropriate application of the principle. In a wider area, such as a Swiss canton, the principle would assume the form of communization. In the case of an independent town or city, such as Hamburg, municipalization would be the natural expression of the principle. But when we come to England, we find the whole people so interdependent upon each other, and their interests extending over the whole country, that it is impossible to split it up into separate and independent communities. The inhabitants of London, for instance, are as much interested in the lands of Devon and Dorset, Essex and Kent, Staffordshire and Yorkshire, even to the Highlands of Scotland, as the inhabitants of those counties. On the produce of the whole country they are dependent for their supplies. On the other hand, the inhabitants of the rural and mining districts throughout the country are as much interested in the lands of our towns and cities, which constitute their markets, as the residents therein. Whatever affects the interests of the one affects also the interests of the other. Higher rents, whether in

¹ WESTMINSTER REVIEW, Sept. 1889, p. 270.

town or country, mean higher prices to consumers, or lower profits to producers, or both. The inhabitants of Great Britain, in fact, constitute one great and indivisible commune, or as a Scotchman, addressing the writer, tersely put it, "What is England but one big clan?" The only consistent application of the principle in this country is, therefore, Land Nationalization. Only by being brought under one responsible administration can the interests of the whole people be effectually and impartially secured. Next, as to government. Some persons have strong prejudices against central government. All governments are corrupt and untrustworthy. No power or patronage should be entrusted to them. Local boards are preferable. Now, where a government consists of some power independent of and irresponsible to the people, we say the less committed to such a government the better. Such a government ought not to exist. That such governments do exist is undeniable; that such a government has existed in England is equally true; but at the present time, here in England, if anywhere, the government is entirely dependent upon the people. If our government is corrupt, it is because the House of Commons is corrupt; and if the House of Commons is corrupt, it is because the people are corrupt, and not true to their own interests. The proper remedy for corruption in the government, therefore, is not in restricting its functions, but in improving the people and Parliament. In our private concerns, if we have a dishonest servant we do not commit our affairs to strangers, but replace the unfaithful servant by one more worthy of confidence; and if we wish to secure fidelity we look sharply after him, and not give him the opportunity of defrauding us. The same course should be pursued by the people at large with reference to national government. As long as a considerable number of the people are indifferent to their political responsibilities, neglect their duty, or allow themselves to be actuated by selfish and unpatriotic motives, they must not be surprised if Parliament and the Government reflect the same characteristics. Let the people be honest and true to themselves, and in a thoroughly patriotic spirit send true and honest men to Parliament, and none but an honest Government can stand for a day. Even under present circumstances, with many anomalies still in our Constitution giving an undue preponderance of power to certain classes of the community, Government not unfrequently finds itself compelled to yield to any general expression of opinion on the part of the people. We are not insensible to the evils, often urged, of excessive centralization; nor, on the other hand, can we shut our eyes to the personal influence and incompetency which too often characterizes local government. Of the two we believe that the acts of a central or government board are more open to the criticism and under the control of the people than are those of a local authority. The deeds of a local board are seldom known beyond

the confines of the district affected. Residents, wishing to live in peace, do not care to make themselves obnoxious to their neighbours by interfering, and therefore, as a rule, take no interest in local affairs; tradespeople can open their lips only under pains and penalties. If any spirit bolder than the rest ventures to raise his voice in opposition to the powers that be, he becomes a marked man, and the authorities simply brave out the opposition and live it down. Of a Government department, on the other hand, every act is or may be known from one end of the country to the other, and is open to the scathing criticism of any and every one who chooses to take up the matter without fear or hindrance. But both central and local government have each their special and appropriate functions, and the advantages are greatest, and the disadvantages least, when to each is assigned its own proper duties. Matters of purely local interest are most appropriately committed to local, those of a wider or national interest to central, administration. The question comes to this, therefore—Is the management of the land a local or a national interest? From what we have said above it will be seen to be essentially and pre-eminently a national interest. To commit it to the control of local authorities, therefore, would be to ensure inefficiency, partiality, and jobbery without remedy; whereas under a central authority it would be entirely under the control of the whole people. There are few farms of any magnitude that are not situated in more than one parish, many even are in more than one county. To bring these under local administration would cause much difficulty and friction. Each local board would have its own peculiar ideas, probably not the most enlightened, of land administration, and would certainly play into the hands of the most influential and interested men in the district. For these reasons we must pronounce emphatically for a central administration of the land. We are ready to admit, however, that local authorities may with advantage be invested with certain delegated powers, and thus be made usefully instrumental in administering the acts of the central authority.

Then, again, many object to central administration on the ground that it confers upon the administrators a large amount of patronage and leads to partiality and favouritism. The same is equally true of local authorities, and the evils would be as manifold as the number of local bodies exceeds that of the central, and the powers would be exercised with more impunity, as shown above, in consequence of their more limited publicity. But under the principles of management we shall hereafter lay down, the administrative authority, whether central or local, will have no power of partiality or favouritism, for it will not be able to select a tenant or fix a rent. Both these will be determined by the applicants themselves, and the authority will have no alternative but to accept and register the result.

Another ground of our preference for a central administration is, that a large board is unnecessary. A few men discreetly selected for their ability, high character, and special knowledge and experience would form a far more efficient administration than boards popularly elected for no special qualifications, and for no other reasons than that by some means they have gained the popular ear. The former, having no personal interest in the matter, and liable to be questioned at any time in Parliament for every act of their department, would have every inducement to consult the requirements and promote the interests of the people. The latter having no knowledge of or interest in anything beyond their own borders, would blunder on with impunity, and in obscurity, intent only on satisfying the more influential and interested of their constituents. For the above reasons, and especially on the ground of economy and efficiency, we feel bound to give our decisive preference for a central administration of the land. The next question is, How is it to be constituted?

The Department would naturally comprise four main divisions:— (1) A secretarial, for correspondence; (2) A registration, for keeping a register of all tenants and their holdings; (3) A financial, for accounts; and (4) A surveying, for inspecting and reporting on the condition and requirements of all holdings. At the head of each of these divisions we propose to appoint a Commissioner, who must be a member of the House of Commons, and over the whole a First or Chief Commissioner, who should be a member of the Cabinet. These five Commissioners would constitute the Land Court, and would have charge of all matters under the Act. Their functions would be purely administrative, on principles laid down and under bye-laws approved by Parliament. They would have no arbitrary power, either to fix a rent or to accept or reject a tenant. Under the Commissioners would be the permanent staff, consisting of a head to each of the four divisions—that is, a chief secretary, a chief registrar, a chief accountant, and a chief surveyor. The greater part of the work, being of a routine character, would be done by an adequate number of rank and file clerks and writers, the organization of which would rest mainly with the heads of divisions, and would to a large extent be provided for by the preliminary work of registration of proprietors and tenants. Doubtless, it will be found expedient to have a branch office and an official representative in each town for the transaction of local business, but it would be entirely subordinate to the central authority.

The next important point for consideration is the mode of letting land—that is, of fixing rent and selecting tenants. Rent has hitherto been arbitrarily fixed by the landlord, and by a tentative process has been gradually increased to its present rate, tenants having no alternative but to submit or go. But this mode of fixing rent is contrary

to sound economic law. The value of any commodity is that which any man will be willing to give for it, and this can be determined only by competition in a free and open market. Land is no exception to this rule. Under a national administration it is most important that the true economic rental value should be determined in some way quite independent of official authority. This can be accomplished only by submitting the land to public competition—not the competition of the auction-room, where men bid half or quarter the value of an article in the hope that, in the absence of a competitor, they will get a great bargain—but by tender, where a man, knowing nothing of his competitors, must put what he considers a fair value upon the land, and take the chance of its proving more valuable to any one else. It is to the national interest that the land should be in the hands of those who can turn it to the best account, and these, as a rule, would offer the highest rents. This mode of letting land by tender would also determine the tenant in every case, and leave no opportunity for a preference of one man before another. The land would thus be entirely under the control of the people, the Commissioners simply recording the result, and protecting alike the individual in his holding and the national property from misuse by the tenant. Objections have been made to this mode of letting land, that it would lead to rack-renting, that in the eager competition for land persons would offer excessive rents which they would be unable to pay, and thus many of the evils of the present system would be reproduced. We think otherwise. The high rents prevalent both in Ireland and in Scotland have not been the result of free competition among tenants, but have been for the most part arbitrarily forced upon those already in possession, who have had no option but to submit or render themselves homeless and hopeless. But under our new system circumstances would be very different. With land in abundance coming into hand every year, there would be no inducement to offer immoderate rents. If a man failed to obtain one holding he would not have long to wait for another opportunity; or he might tender for two or more at the same time, when, if his offers were reasonable, he would be pretty certain of getting one. After a few years the rental value of land brought constantly and regularly before the public would be known as accurately as the price of shares and stocks is now, and would vary within narrow limits as they do according as the balance of the numerous conditions affecting it tended this way or that. Under this system land courts and valuers, whether official or professional, would be dispensed with, and the entire cost saved to the great advantage of both the tenant and the nation. No one can know better the value of land than those who use it.

The next point to be determined is the length of tenancy which should be granted. This will vary with circumstances, and must

a large extent be the result of experience. All we can do on the present occasion is to fix the extreme limits beyond which we should not go, and to notice the leading incidents affecting it. Perpetual tenure is out of the question, being equivalent to ownership, however limited in other respects, and opposed to the equal right which every man has of access to land, a right which every one should have the opportunity of exercising equally with others, but which would be seriously restricted if the land or any considerable portion of it were tied up in perpetual tenure. Life tenures are open to the same objections as life annuities, involving uncertainty and loss to one or the other of the parties interested. Tenure for a fixed term of years alone remains, and the question is, What shall this term be? The interest of the tenant requires that it shall be long enough to secure him a fair return for his labour and the responsibilities he incurs—long enough to induce him to do his best, but not so long as to make him responsible for changing conditions which he cannot foresee or estimate. In the case of ordinary agricultural land already in good condition with all needful appliances, and requiring only capital to stock and work it, the term must at least be long enough to give the tenant an average round of seasons, and the least that would secure this would be seven years. This we may take, therefore, as the minimum length of term. In the case where special outlay of capital is needed for improvements, such as drainage, fencing, road-making, enlargement of buildings, cottage accommodation, &c., the execution of which would be included in the conditions of letting, the term would have to be extended to ten, fourteen, or twenty-one years, or perhaps even longer, according to the amount of outlay, to enable the tenant to recoup himself for his expenditure during his tenure. Here is the opportunity for the capitalist, who would find a more secure and profitable employment for his capital than in lending it to foreign Governments at low interest. The tenant having in his tender so adjusted the rent as to secure a return of his capital with interest during his tenancy, the land, at the expiration of the term, would revert to the nation in an improved condition, and the latter would then reap its share of the advantage in the shape of an improved rent without confiscating anything to which the tenant could reasonably lay claim. But the question has been put, How will this affect a man who plants an orchard which takes many years to attain maturity? Such a case could be met in this way:—Applicants should tender an initial rent, subject to an annual increase, say two or three shillings an acre. The larger the annual increase, the lower would be the initial rent offered with some advantage to the planter, as his rent would begin low, and increase as he became able to pay it. Suppose the initial rent offered be ten shillings an acre, increasing two shillings annually for a term of twenty-one years, the rent would increase from ten shillings the

first year to fifty shillings the last year. If it commenced at five shillings, with a yearly increment of three shillings, it would rise to sixty-five shillings in the last year. The difference between the two for the whole term would be only five guineas for the additional convenience the planter would enjoy during the first six years of his term. The increment and length of term would be fixed by the Commissioners, the applicant would make his own calculation as to cost of planting and annual returns, and tender accordingly. He would, of course, be under the obligation to maintain the fertility of the plantation to the end of his term. In a similar manner any other special case, such as reclaiming waste land, clearing wood, &c., could be met. The object in all such cases should be to give the utmost facility to the labourer during the earlier and more arduous years of his tenancy.

The next class of property we have to apply our principle to is land to be let for building but not yet covered. As we propose that all buildings, except agricultural, shall remain the property of those who erect them, the long terms now granted in such cases will be no longer necessary. From seven to twenty-one years will probably be found sufficient according to circumstances, and the term should on no account be extended so as to deprive the nation of the increased value sites acquire from increase of population. In the first instance, the ground would be let by tender which would fix the rent for the term. At the expiration of a ground lease the building would be valued, and so much of the rent as appeared reasonable allotted to the owner. The premises as a whole would then be offered by tender, and the balance of the rent offered above that allotted to the building would be the ground-rent payable to the State. As it is necessary for security that the owner of the building should be the lessee of the ground, one of the conditions on which a new lease is offered would be that in the event of the owner of the building being outbid by another party, the accepted tenant should purchase the building at the valuation price. If the owner of the building wishes to retain his property his would doubtless be the highest tender, as it would be of a greater value to him than to a stranger. If he were indifferent or wished to sell he would tender or not accordingly, but in either case would be sure of the value of his property.

There is a third case, that of shop property, in which a third interest is involved—viz., the goodwill of a business which clearly belongs to the occupier, whether he is also the owner of the building or not. If this goodwill could be appraised with as much certainty as the building, it might be protected in the same way by means of a reserved price payable by the incoming to the outgoing tenant. But its value is so uncertain, and there is, moreover, such scope for misrepresentation and fraud, that the case could not be met in that

way. Some special means, therefore, must be adopted by which the interest of the occupier may be protected without prejudice to the other interests involved.' We suggest the following as one, not the only method by which this may be attained. Not less than six nor more than twelve months before the expiration of a lease the tenant may, on the ground that he wishes to retain the goodwill of his business, apply to the Commissioners for permission to send in a special tender for a new lease. The Commissioners, on being satisfied with the *bona-fides* of the applicant, and that it is a suitable case for the exercise of the privilege, may assent to the application and fix a date for considering the tender. The Commissioners would know from experience what any particular site would be likely to command. Previous to opening the applicant's tender, they should lay upon the table, in a sealed envelope, their estimate of value. The applicant's tender should first be opened in his presence, then the estimate of the Commissioners, which should not be divulged, and if the applicant's tender is at or above the estimate, it should be accepted. If so approximately near as to indicate a *bona fide* offer differing only by an accidentally small amount, he might be permitted to amend his offer if he chose. If his offer proved much below the estimate, it would be rejected and the premises would be offered to public tender in the usual way. He would still have the opportunity of tendering among others, but would have to take the risk of being outbid. In the latter case he would have only himself to blame; he has had his opportunity and lost it. Experience may enable us to improve upon this plan, but it is the best we can think of at present, and at any rate much more favourable to the tenant than the present system which places him at the absolute mercy of the landlord or his agent.

Objection has been made to leasehold tenure, more particularly of agricultural land, that under it tenants are liable to disturbance at the expiration of their term, and would thereby be discouraged from doing their best with the land lest some one else should reap an advantage from their labours, and further that there would be an inducement for selfish and ill-disposed tenants to neglect or exhaust the land during the last year or two of their lease. Against such a dereliction of duty and abuse of the national property due precaution would be taken. A condition of every holding would be that the tenant should maintain and deliver it up in good condition, both as regards fertility of soil and repair of buildings and all appurtenances. His failure to do so should render him liable to damages, and disqualify him from holding land in future. The land being national property, in which every tenant has an interest beyond that of his holding, no true patriot would seek thus to aggrandize himself at the public expense. Any attempt to do so should brand him with disgrace as an unworthy member of the community. While

we protect ourselves against dishonest men we must legislate for the honest. With regard to disturbance, we think that the cases of involuntary removal would be extremely rare. A tenant in possession will always have an advantage over an outsider in his superior knowledge of the holding and its capabilities, and in freedom from expense of entering and stocking. He could, therefore, always offer as high or somewhat higher rent than a stranger. In the case of equal tender, he should have the preference, and if the difference between his tender and the highest was very small, indicating an honest bid, he might be allowed even to amend his tender if he wished. On the other hand, there are advantages under the leasehold system that would greatly outweigh the occasional disturbance of a tenant; which after all is no more than leaseholders both in the country and in towns are now subject to at much greater inconvenience. There are few men who settle down in a position in early life with the determination that they will remain in that position to the end of their days. Most men aspire to something like progress and seek to improve their position from time to time. The leasehold system affords convenient opportunities and encouragement for this. A young man, for instance, commencing life with a small capital and little experience, takes a small farm of, say, fifty acres for seven or ten years. At the expiration of his term, if he has been successful and careful, he may find himself in a position to take a larger farm of, say, two hundred acres, and a growing family may render it expedient for him to do so. He accordingly searches the list, that would be published by the Department, of farms to be let, and selecting one or more suitable to his purpose, would tender for them, vacating his former holding, which would be available for another young beginner. At the expiration of another lease, he may find himself in a position to take a still larger farm, say, of five hundred acres. This spirit of progress is much more worthy of encouragement than the lethargic spirit of a man who says, "Well, here is my living; my bread and cheese or potatoes are sure, and I shall rest content, take my ease, and trouble myself for nothing further." The circulation which would be induced by more frequent removal would also be much more conducive to social, moral, and intellectual progress than the stagnation which too often characterizes agricultural populations. Fixity of tenure—that is, allowing tenants to retain their holdings as long as they please unconditionally—is unfavourable to the spirit of progress, and encourages the unaspiring and indolent to hold land away from those who would make a much better use of it. Under anything in the shape of perpetual tenure, a man might look far and long before meeting with a farm to suit him, and when the opportunity did occur, might find equal difficulty in disposing of his present holding. The uncertainty and difficulty of obtaining land under these conditions

would deter men of enterprise from devoting themselves to agricultural pursuits, and would thus be detrimental to national progress. All things considered, the advantages of a leasehold system appear to us greatly to outweigh its disadvantages.

Having given our reasons for preferring

1. A central administration,
2. Letting land by public tender,
3. Leasehold tenancies for terms of years,

we may now gather up the threads and weave them into further leading clauses of our Bill,¹ thus—

IV. That for the future administration of the land a national department be established to be called the Land Department.

V. That this Department consist of four principal divisions—viz. : (1) a Secretarial division, for conducting the correspondence of the Department; (2) a Registration division, for keeping a register of all tenants and their holdings; (3) an Accountants', or Financial, division, for keeping the accounts of the Department; and (4) a Surveyor's division, for inspecting all holdings and advising as to their condition, improvements required, &c.

VI. That at the head of each of these divisions a Commissioner be appointed by the Government of the day, who must be a member of Parliament and responsible thereto for the entire conduct of his division.

VII. That a Chief Commissioner be appointed who shall be a member of the Cabinet, and responsible to Parliament for the entire policy of the Department.

VIII. That the said five Commissioners constitute the National Land Court, with authority to determine all matters under the Act.

IX. That at the head of the respective divisions, but under the Commissioners, be appointed a Permanent Secretary, a Permanent Registrar, a Permanent Accountant, and a Permanent Surveyor.

X. That to the respective divisions be also appointed an Assistant Secretary, an Assistant Registrar, an Assistant Accountant, and an Assistant Surveyor.

XI. That to the above-named officers and Commissioners be entrusted the further organization of the Department, and the drawing up of rules and bye-laws, subject to the sanction of Parliament.

XII. That all land henceforth be let by public tender for such terms of years and under such conditions as to the Commissioners may appear expedient in the interest both of the nation and of the tenants.

XIII. That, in order to bring all unemployed labour as far as possible on the land, it be an instruction to the Commissioners to provide allotments and small holdings wherever and to whatever

¹ See previous article referred to, WESTMINSTER REVIEW, p. 273.

extent they may be required on such terms and conditions as shall be as favourable as possible to the workers consistent with the national interest.

It is unnecessary to encumber this paper with the further details of the measure or with the inner organization of the Department, which must be entrusted to men of practical ability and experience. The above outline will enable any one to realize our ideal scheme of administration. That it will not be open to numerous objections from various points of view, or occasionally to abuse by selfish and ill-disposed men, is more than we can venture to hope. It is put forth as a first tentative scheme from a purely national point of view, open to any possible amendment, or to be superseded altogether by any better scheme that can be produced.

Let us glance for a moment at some of the results which may be confidently anticipated from carrying such a scheme into effect. Landlords will be little, if any, worse off than they are now. All they will lose is the iniquitous power they now possess to prey upon the people, to enrich themselves at the expense of the national industry, and to obstruct that industry by their arbitrary control. Tenants will everywhere be free from the hand of oppression, will have security of tenure so far as is consistent with national interests and the equal rights of their fellow-citizens, on terms and conditions fixed by themselves in competition with each other, and will be at liberty to conduct their business in their own way so long as fidelity to the national trust is observed. The nation will profit by whatever additional value is given to the land by the expanding industry of the people. Labour will everywhere find full and remunerative employment. The minimum unit of wages will be that which any one can earn by applying his labour to land, for land being accessible to all, no one will work for another for less than he can himself earn from the land. All superfluous labour will be drained off from the towns to the great relief and advantage of those who remain. The country will be again dotted over with agricultural and industrial villages. For fifty or a hundred small holders, planted in any spot, would soon grow into a village, while there are many manual industries at present carried on in the crowded centres of our great towns which might be removed to such rural villages with great advantage. Many other advantages will suggest themselves as possible under the system we advocate which are impossible at present. Take, for instance, our suburban roads. Instead of the ugly, dreary, noisy thoroughfares they now are, hemmed in by brick and mortar, dusty in summer, muddy in winter, they might be laid out in this fashion:—A good roadway in the middle, with tram lines if need be; if asphalted, it would be a universal tramway for all vehicles, especially if mechanical were substituted for animal power; on each side of this roadway a strip of plantation 30 feet

wide, laid out with trees and shrubs, grass, and flowers; next to these a good footpath, asphalted, 10 to 12 feet wide; next, the front gardens of the houses, which latter should be set back 30 to 50 feet, the fences to be open iron above three feet from the ground. These footways would then form clean and delightful promenades for the inhabitants of the neighbourhood without having to trudge some five or six miles to a so-called breathing hole before they could get a glimpse of a green leaf or a blade of grass. The land thus given up for the benefit of the people, without the enormous cost which has now to be paid to save a bit of land from being covered with brick and mortar, would be more than compensated for by the additional value given to the land on either side. Along such roads would be built detached houses from £80 to £150 rental value. In cross-roads from these would be smaller houses and shops, while sites for larger houses, with more ample grounds, would be reserved in more retired situations. At convenient spots, and within easy reach of the main roads, should be erected blocks of dwellings for artisans. These should be built on a large scale, accommodating at least a thousand families, or from five to six thousand inmates, provided with all the comforts and conveniences suitable to their life.

These buildings should be quadrangular in form, enclosing an open court some 500 feet square, which would be the playground of the children. The private rooms should be 18 ft. by 12 ft., the back portion being the sleeping apartment, which could be curtained off during the day, having a convenient sitting-room 15 ft. by 12 ft. Besides these private rooms, to prevent overcrowding, there should be dormitories for children from ten to fourteen years of age, others for youths and maidens from fourteen to eighteen, and others for adults of both sexes. These dormitories should be divided into cubicles by partitions, so as to secure privacy. In addition to these there should be a public dining hall, with ample cooking accommodation, where the inmates could either cook for themselves or purchase what they require ready cooked by some of their number appointed for the purpose. In this room families could sit at tables and partake of a better meal, breakfast, dinner, tea or supper, with much more comfort and at far less expense than most of the class can now obtain in their miserable homes. Then there should be a reading-room, well supplied with suitable literature; a recreation-room, where there could be free conversation and innocent games; a work-room for females only, when they wish to be apart; a lecture-room which, if denominational prejudice did not stand in the way, might also be used as a chapel. Schools should be provided within the building for boys, for girls, and for infants; a *crèche* might be added where infants under school age might be taken care of during the absence of their mothers by some of the inmates appointed for the purpose. Bath, lavatories, and washhouses would, of course, be

included. The whole of the buildings should be heated by hot water, lighted by electricity, and carefully ventilated. The rent of a room should include all this, with free access to all the public rooms and conveniences. These rooms, with all these comforts and conveniences, would not cost more than is mostly paid for wretched apartments in the crowded parts of the metropolis and other large towns. Around the entire building a belt of land should be laid out as allotment gardens, and let at a moderate rent to those of the inmates who are disposed to spend a portion of their leisure time in such a healthy and delightful occupation as gardening.

Fifty colonies like these planted around London would relieve the most congested parts of the metropolis of a quarter of a million of its inhabitants, at much less cost than the hideous blocks of buildings that have recently been erected, and with infinite advantage, physical, mental, and moral, to the inmates.

Instead of four millions of people being crowded on a hundred square miles as now, they might be spread over four hundred. Sites could then be had for schools and other public purposes without cost or difficulty, and metropolitan improvements could be effected with a gain to the revenue instead of enormous losses to the ratepayers at present incurred.

In placing labourers upon small holdings of land it is not necessary to isolate them and reduce them to a state of primitive semi-barbarism. A thatched cottage on a patch of land may have a romantic charm for some æsthetic natures, but if they had to live such a life the romance and the charm would soon, we think, disappear. If civilization has any merit, any advantages, why should it not be brought within reach, as far as practicable, of our agricultural labourers? The comforts, the conveniences, the pleasures of social life, are quite compatible with rural occupation, and if it is the duty of the community to provide comfortable and healthy dwellings for the poor in towns, it is not less the duty of the State to provide for those in the country. With this object in view, we would suggest the following plan for providing small holdings:—Let a thousand acres of suitable land, conveniently situated, be divided into two hundred plots of five acres each. Instead of leaving each occupant to erect a miserable hut, destitute of all conveniences and far removed from his fellow-man, let a block of buildings be erected in the middle of the estate, with private and public rooms and schools sufficient for the entire community, which would consist probably of a thousand individuals, men, women, and children. These buildings (on the same plan as those we have sketched for town workers), with good water supply, well lighted and heated, would at the same cost afford far better and more healthy accommodation than is possible in detached cottages, while, though the individual freedom and independence of the inmates

would in nowise be diminished, their closer proximity would enable them to enjoy the pleasures of social intercourse to any extent they pleased without resort to the public-house. Facility would also be afforded for mutual aid and co-operation. By clubbing their shillings together they could purchase their first plough and team of horses to be used by all in turn. They could come to any arrangement they pleased with regard to crops, exchanging produce and thus supplementing each other's labour. Ranges of sheds should be put up at convenient places round the margin of the estate, affording accommodation for cows, pigs, storage of produce, and tools. The hire of one plot of land should carry with it at least one good-sized private room, with free access to all the public rooms, attendance at school for the children, if any, and adequate shed accommodation. But we would not restrict a man to one or two plots if he is able to utilize more, provided other applicants were not excluded thereby. In this way all the comforts and conveniences of civilized life may be combined with the pleasures of rural occupation. A thousand villages like this planted all over the country would relieve our congested towns of a million of their surplus population, to the great advantage both of those who were removed and of those that remained. These are visions possible as soon as, but not before, the land has been brought under the control of the nation, and landlords prevented from appropriating the results of other people's industry.

F. L. SOPER.

·THOMAS DRUMMOND.¹

DRUMMOND is the one British official whose memory every true Irishman venerates. When he was stricken down at the untimely age of forty-six, there was a chorus of lamentation throughout the island. O'Connell had fixed the next day for a great meeting; but the moment the news came, he said: "There must be no meeting now. Tell the Leinster delegates not to come up. Nothing must be done till we've paid our last tribute of respect and esteem by following him to the grave." "No Irishman," said the *Dublin Evening Post*, "was ever more thoroughly, more cordially Irish than he; more resolved, as far as his power went—and he was a man of the first mental capacity, as far as his influence extended—and that was, fortunately for the country, great indeed, to better the state of things, to promote prosperity, and above all to dispense equal and impartial justice." "Mr. Drummond," said the *Freeman's Journal*, "was chief among those whose anxiety to serve this country reconciled the people to the experiment of giving the Union another trial." Even the *Evening Packet* [Orange] admitted that "he was the sheet-anchor of the Executive, and filled office during a period of great difficulty." "Ireland's benefactor," the *Newry Examiner* called him; while the *Morning Register* wrote: "It is not enough to fix the memory of Mr. Drummond in the nation's heart—the first English official, in the long centuries of our connection with England, so enshrined; we must testify to civilized Europe, to England, to our posterity, how we prize his rare and inestimable services. Where he has chosen a tomb there will also be his monument. Let our people and their children learn to look with pride on the grave of one whose love for Ireland is a pattern and a model to every statesman." "As good a man and as efficient a public officer as ever the world produced," said the *Northern Whig*; and in England the feeling was equally strong. The estimates of his character given by men like Lord Spencer and Lord Ebrington were of the same kind. The *Morning Chronicle* stated the bare truth when it doubted "if, in the whole range of the public service, a loss could have been sustained more deeply to be deplored and less easily to be supplied." The silence of the *Times* and the *Morning Post*, Sir G. Phillips con-

¹ *Thomas Drummond, Under-Secretary in Ireland 1835-40. Life and Letters.* By R. Barry O'Brien, of the Middle Temple, Barrister-at-Law, Author of *Fifty Years of Concessions to Ireland*, &c. London: Kegan Paul & Co.

Thomas Drummond.

siders "an unwilling tribute of respect and praise and deference to public opinion." O'Connell walked in his funeral procession. "Never before and never since," says Mr. O'Brien, "has an Irish leader, possessing the confidence of the vast majority of his countrymen, followed an English official to the grave." Nor has the feeling died out. As his statue in the City Hall stands beside those of Charles Lucas, Grattan, and O'Connell, so his memory is in our hearts side by side with theirs. He is still, for the people for whose sake he died, emphatically the strong, wise, just man who made it his life's work to right their wrongs.

For whose sakes—yes; for no man was ever more undoubtedly killed by overwork and worry. Lord Spencer had long been urging him to give up work and to come into Parliament; but he was determined that his Report on the Railway System should be, like everything else he had taken in hand, perfect, treating not merely of the railway question but of the social and economical state of the people. Hard work on the Trigonometrical Survey had quite knocked him up in 1825; and it was only what his mother called "his partiality for Ireland" that carried him through the five years of his secretariat, with its immense responsibility and the need of constant dealing with "burning questions," coupled with more than the usual amount of weary office routine.

Born in 1797, second son of a Writer to the Signet, Thomas Drummond, at sixteen, got a nomination for Woolwich. He sailed from Leith to Gravesend, meaning to catch the London coach; but the steward forgot to call him, and he got ashore ten minutes after the coach had started. He chased it for three miles, but in vain. Fortunately a return chaise came and took him within two miles of Woolwich. Here the driver insisted on stopping, and it only wanted twenty minutes to eleven—the time of examination. Drummond ran the two miles in a quarter of an hour, presented himself, and passed with flying colours. Woolwich he hated—he was afraid of being shelved as an Artillery lieutenant on 5s. 6d. a day. Still he worked hard, getting in his first year to be first in mathematics in the fourth academy, and in two years and a half gaining a commission in the Engineers. He soon started as an inventor, making a model of a new kind of pontoon; but "there was no wish at the office to bring forward anything of that kind." In 1818, weary of enforced idleness, he had actually put down his name at Lincoln's Inn when he met Colonel Colby of the Ordnance Survey of Scotland. His asking Drummond to join him was the turning-point in the young Engineer's career. With Colby he worked for some time in England, and when in 1824 the Irish survey began, the friends had a much freer hand than before; the Select Committee wishing to push the work on rapidly, and also to have it carried out with the best appliances. The great need, Drummond had already found, was a light

so strong that observations could be made in dull weather. In 1823 he had gone to Brande's and Faraday's lectures at the Royal Institution. Here some hint about the burning of lime in oxygen suggested the idea of his famous lamp. Former triangulators had tried various expedients. General Roy burned Bengal or white lights; then came the day of Argand burners, with parabolic reflectors, which were succeeded by Fresnel's plano-convex lenses of concentric rings. Drummond at first tried phosphorus in oxygen, but the flame was large and unsteady, besides the difficulty of getting rid of the fumes. What in London is called "flame-lime" proved in every way the best medium, its incandescence giving thirty-seven times the intensity of an Argand burner, that of magnesia only sixteen times. The first trial, at the Tower, was a grand success; and in 1825 the light was used on Sliebh Snaght, in Innishowen. The weather from August to October had been misty. From Divis mountain, near Belfast, the central station, any ordinary light on Sliebh Snaght was quite invisible. We can imagine the enthusiasm when, early in November, the Divis watchers saw as it were a star of the first magnitude shine out on the Snaght, sixty miles off. Then came triumphs; William IV., who as Duke of Clarence had seen one of the earliest experiments, was pleased to say: "God bless my soul; that's very wonderful," when Drummond, presenting his book, pointed out that his light cast a shadow at ten miles' distance; and followed up his admiration by inviting the inventor to dine at the Pavilion. Almost as useful on survey as this "lime or oxyhydrogen light" was his heliostat, of which, as well of the light, Mr. O'Brien gives a minute account. But Drummond was destined for more important work; he was perfecting his invention, and trying to make it suitable for light-houses, when he was drawn into politics. He met Lord Brougham at a dinner, after which he showed his light; and the Chancellor was so impressed with him that he had him made Chairman of a Boundary Commission, to decide which boroughs should be swept away and to reconstruct the political areas. At this work he acquitted himself so well that his fellow-Commissioners presented him with his portrait, and Lord Althorp pressed him to be his private secretary; and when in 1835 the Melbourne Ministry came in, he was made Under-Secretary at Dublin, Lord Mulgrave being the Lord-Lieutenant, and Lord Morpeth Chief Secretary. He came to Ireland in the middle of the tithe war; the Orangemen were enraged at the passing of Catholic emancipation; the Catholics were bitterly disappointed because, four years after the passing of the Bill, there was not a single Catholic judge or stipendiary magistrate, and only one high sheriff. Mr. O'Brien gives several of the most striking incidents of the tithe war. At Carrickshock, not far from Serpount Abbey, on the line between Kilkenny and Waterford, there was a desperate battle, in which eleven peasants fell and eleven police. The worst case was where Archdeacon

Ryder brought a squadron of dragoons, a detachment of infantry, and a strong body of police to force widow Ryan, of Gortroe, Co. Cork, to pay 40s. tithes and costs. In this fight twelve peasants were killed, forty-two wounded, none on the other side being severely injured. Of a jury of twenty-three, thirteen brought in wilful murder against police and soldiers, two manslaughter, eight justifiable homicide. This was the last tithe fight; Drummond arriving a few months after was able to prevent a renewal of the war. Of course, the "eternal land war," as Mr. O'Brien calls it, was still waged. The landlords evicted without pity, and the tenants murdered without remorse. There was no poor-law till 1838; so that eviction was in many cases a death sentence. Lord Donoughmore admitted that "the Irish landlords have been in the habit of letting land, not farms"; and Lord Normanby aptly summed up in these remarkable words: "While the relation of landlord and tenant in England is one of sympathy without dependence, in Ireland it is often one of entire dependence without a shadow of sympathy" (O'Brien, p. 88). It is an old story, the rights of which Englishmen ought by this time to understand, if indeed they ever will be at the pains to understand any Irish matter. But while thousands are still led astray by the nonsense that Mr. Goschen and others talk about "sacredness of contract" and "rights of property," it is well that Mr. O'Brien should have devoted a good many pages to the land question. Somebody may read him who has never read any of the voluminous literature, ranging from Arthur Young, Suffolk squire and farming enthusiast (who declared that "the smaller Irish gentry are the vermin of the soil," and that the Whiteboys were more sinned against than sinning), down to Mr. Nassau Senior, who points out that "the tenants without assistance create the estates—it is they, for instance, who have raised the barony of Farney, of which the fee-simple was worth £3000 to a rental of £50,000 a year." Were Mr. Nassau Senior alive, he would also have instanced Mr. Olphert's property, of which the fee-simple was bought for £300, while the tenants have by unwearied labour raised its yearly rent to £2200.

Does anybody read the right books about Ireland? I fancy Mr. Froude's *Two Chiefs of Dunboy* has fallen flat; it gives too startling a picture of English misrule. Englishmen don't mind admitting in a general way that Ireland has been badly treated; but when the monstrous follies are catalogued and specified they get weary, if not angry. The kind of book I find the "classes" look to for their views on the Irish question is Captain Hawley Smart's *Master of Rathkelly*, in which the horsey part is naturally very good, the love-making so-so, the rest a *réchauffé* of Tory newspaper "atrocities," with additions, such as the writer may have heard at some squireep's table, the whole being as truthful a picture as that of the correspondent of the *Temps* who, by miraculous good luck, came upon "an earless man

driving six tailless cows just outside Tralee." The mischief done by such a book is incalculable. Talk of obscene photographs, talk of libidinous verses! Here is a book of which young English readers of both sexes will suck in every word as true, whereas of its significant parts there is not a line that is not either false or a *suggestio falsi*. Pity that a popular writer should publish such mischievous nonsense without investigation; for on such books English opinion is formed, and the rising generation is taught to despise and hate a people which more than any other in the world deserves not unreasoning love, not silly praise, but patient study and thoughtful reasonable allowance. These latter are what Drummond brought to his task as Under-Secretary, with powers as practically unlimited as those which Mr. A. J. Balfour now exercises. He had seen much of the country. The Survey lasted six years, of which four at least were spent in Ireland; and in four years such a man would get to know far more about it than thousands do who are born and bred there. On the land question he had made up his mind. He felt (as the *Times* of 26th December 1835, *quantum mutatus* expressed it) that "the conduct of many Irish proprietors in the process of what they call 'clearing their estates' is an infamous disgrace to human nature,"¹ for he had learnt that this crop of wretched cottiers had been deliberately bred by the fathers and grandfathers of those who drove them out with the twofold object of increasing their rent-roll and of multiplying voters. He had also made up his mind about Orangeism. To this Mr. O'Brien devotes a hundred pages, giving us the whole of the inexpressibly dreary correspondence between Captain Blennerhasset Fairman and the Duke of Cumberland, Lord Kenyon, the Duke of Gordon, &c. Fairman, the Colonel Saunderson of that day, was sent over to England and Scotland under the Duke of Cumberland's Seal as Grand Master, on a "tour of inspection" to see that all was in readiness for some great enterprise, this being on the evidence of ex-Orangeman Haywood, nothing less than deposing William IV. for sanctioning reform, and putting the Duke of Cumberland on the throne. Haywood died just as the libel case which followed this declaration was coming on; but so much evidence had been brought together that the House of Commons urged the king to dissolve the Orange organization. Unhappily this was only very partially done. The system of affiliated lodges under one grand central lodge was broken up, the Army lodges suppressed, &c.; but in Ireland the lodges, henceforth unaffiliated, continued to hold armed demonstrations and to organize processions. Nearly all the magistrates being Orangemen, convictions were well-nigh impossible. It was like what Juvenal describes as going on in Egypt between

¹ Had the *Times* always written thus, Drummond would not have called it (p. 69) "that profligate and perfidious journal." Alas! then as always the *Times* of one day was no index to what the moneyed interest, or some other interest, would force it to be on the next.

soldier and civilian, *Ubi tu pugnas ego vapulo tantum*. Irishmen know how Orangeism arose—how like every other Irish difficulty it began about the land. Armagh and Antrim landlords, in the last quarter of the eighteenth century, found Catholics more squeezable than Protestants, and therefore they put them into vacant farms. The Protestants resented this, much as the Massarene tenants now resent the substitution of Northern Orangemen for the evicted Catholics. But with characteristic brutality they formed a society called Peep o' Day Boys, and warned the Catholics to give up their farms. A doggel notice was posted on the farm doors. De la Tocnaye, a Breton *émigré* who walked through Ireland in 1715, describes the mode of action. If the notice was disregarded, some morning at daybreak "the Boys" came and set fire to the thatch and turned the inmates on the road. The Catholics formed a protection society which called itself "Defenders"; but the others, having the use and practice of arms and the confidence that England would back them up, were far the fiercer. Lord Gosford and a number of his fellow-magistrates, Protestants, formulated their famous protest. They may possibly have been actuated by a preference for manageable Catholic tenants instead of rowdy Protestants. But they were in the minority; the mass of the gentry looked on and let the Peep o' Days work their will. It seemed impossible to interfere with them without showing favour to the Catholics—relaxing the Penal Laws; and this they were determined not to do. And England backed them up. She had so long ruled on the lines of "Protestant Ascendancy," of ignoring the very existence in law of their Catholic subjects, that she dared not say boldly, "the Catholic shall have equal justice with the Protestant." To put down the Peep o' Day Boys would have been construed into an attack on the Protestant faith, and would have led to a "No Popery" cry being raised in England. It was far easier to keep up the *status quo*; to connive at this wild, informal eviction work which selfish greed was carrying on in the name of Protestant truth.¹ Having grown respectable, allowed if not recognized by Pitt, the "Boys" killed about fifty Catholics in what is called "the Battle of the Diamond," and re-christened themselves after "the glorious and immortal Orange William." As we read the evidence before the House in 1835 of Mr. Christie, the Quaker, to the effect that, in Armagh, sometimes twelve or fourteen houses would be "wrecked" or burned in a night, until the Catholic population was well-nigh extirpated, we wonder what Pitt's idea of good government in Ireland could have been. The most disgusting feature in the rules which the Peep o' Day Boys formulated is their religious tincture. Here

¹ These wholesale drivings out of Catholics were one cause of "congested districts." De la Tocnaye met strings of families sadly moving Shannonwards, and there they found shelter on the poor lands of Colonel Martin and Lord Altamont.

was a society which began in pure greed, and which schemed for political support by undertaking "to preserve the British connection;" yet the members prayed "that every Orangeman should be blessed with charity, brotherly love and loyalty, and be truly respectable on earth and eternally happy hereafter;" and the Orangeman's qualifications are stated to be "a humane and compassionate disposition, and a kind and courteous behaviour, a hatred of cursing and swearing," &c. This is quaint, when "To hell with the Pope" was one of their usual toasts, a more recondite form of it, invented by an Orange policeman, being "The Pope in the pillory, the pillory in hell, and the devil pelting him with priests." The charity and brotherly love were abundantly exhibited in the rebellion of '98, which would never have broken out at all had the Catholics not been goaded into madness by the intolerable brutality of the Orangemen, and by the impossibility of getting redress from tribunals composed of Orange magistrates. That was what changed the "United Irishmen" from a small body of mostly Protestant enthusiasts, much like Drs. Priestley and Price, and their friends in England and Scotland, into a national party. "We're persecuted, we are driven out; our wives and daughters are outraged; Carhampton and Lake, and the fiends whom they profess to command, are let loose upon us; and these united men offer us liberty and brotherhood — us who can never hope for even a scrap of justice if we sit down under the present state of things." So argued the Catholics of the North, whose patience "free quarters" had finally exhausted; and the word went round to Wexford and the South; and thus, '98 with all its horrors, with the memories that still cling round it, was the direct result of Orangeism, aided and abetted by Pitt (who wanted a good big outbreak that he might force on the Union), and, because it had Pitt's aid, driving the Catholics to despair.¹ It must have been a strange commentary on English rule when England, instead of loyally fulfilling the promises of the Union, tightened the bonds of repression, and for over thirty years ruled Ireland by and for a faction. Colonel Verner's language (to be referred to by-and-by) shows what a brutally domineering spirit had been fostered among the Orangemen. They were the spoiled children of Ascendancy, and the fantastic tricks they played are almost past belief. We must always remember that from successive Arms' Acts they were free; that, while the other side were disarmed, they swaggered about with gun and pistol, practice in which filled part of their ordinary meetings. In England (as I said) they soon got to the end of their tether. When the "Fairman Plot" came to light, when the Duke of Cumberland's most injudicious conduct was known, when it was found that there

¹ The heaven-born Minister is getting shown up in his true colours; Gouverneur Morris, quoting Church, and giving also his own experience, throws some very dry light on him.

were Orange lodges even in the army, the thing was at once put down. Public opinion was against it. But in Ireland its supporters cared nothing for public opinion; for centuries it had been their business to set such opinion at naught. They were in their own estimation the public; the masses didn't count. How needful a strong man was in dealing with Orangeism in Ireland may be judged from one instance. In 1830 on the Boyne anniversary, the Orangemen determined as usual to have a grand demonstration at Crossgar. The stipendiary magistrate, Sharman Crawford, was equally determined to uphold the newly-made law. By his orders the police pulled down one triumphal arch, but they refused to pull down another as the Orangemen had said they would resist. Crawford sent for reinforcements to Downpatrick, read the Riot Act, and ordered the police to clear the town. They declined, urging they had not force enough, whereupon he again sent for more police and drove out the processionists, making several arrests. There were but few Sharman Crawfords among the magistrates. This is the sole instance of hearty repression before Drummond came. Things were almost invariably managed in something like the following way: In a grand meeting in Dungannon in 1834, Lords Caledon, Abercorn, Belmore, Claude Hamilton, besides a swarm of J.P.'s and clergy of the Established Church took part. Party tunes were played, flags carried, and shots fired, one almost grazing the ear of Inspector-General Sir F. Stover. Stover went to Murray, the magistrate, and said, "Mr. Murray, do you call this keeping the peace? I never saw anything so bad in my life. Why, I've just been shot at, and if you don't stop the firing I shall think it the most disgraceful thing I ever saw." Mr. Murray would not act; and the day wound up with Lord Claude Hamilton's installation into the Brotherhood, amid a scene of wild uproar in a drink-shop. No doubt the shot was intended; for Mrs. Duff, wife of the chief constable, found next Sunday in her prayer-book a warning to "that d—d Duff and Sir F. Stover, warning them to keep indoors or they may get an Orange ball." She had got the notice too late, through not going to church the Sunday before. Nearly all the J.P.'s being active Orangemen, and the remainder, like Mr. Murray, afraid to act, "the brethren generally had it all their own way, with the result that the evidence before the House in 1835 showed there had never been a 12th of July without bloodshed and wrecking."

Nor was there any redress in the Courts. Thus, in a fight in Co. Fermanagh, the Orangemen, being beaten, went to their lodge, fetched their guns, and fired on their opponents. A Catholic was killed, and his father went from magistrate to magistrate to swear an information against his supposed murderer. One and all the magistrates refused to receive the information, and the murderer went to America. At the assizes the judge ordered the magistrates

to take the information; the accused came home, was tried and acquitted, as were a number of his fellow-rioters. At the same assizes a number of Catholics, arrested after the same riot, were all convicted.¹ And if magistrates shirked their duty, juries openly refused to do theirs. A man who broke into a chapel and stole the vestments appeared in dock wearing an Orange ribbon, and refused to make any defence. Judge Fletcher (one of Ireland's few honest judges) told the jury that they had nothing to try; the prisoner had, in fact, confessed his guilt. Without a moment's hesitation they found him "not guilty." "Thank God, gentlemen, it's your verdict, not mine," said the judge. "I won't placard your names on the session-house door, but I'll order the sheriff to discharge you from doing any further duty at these assizes." On leaving the dock the prisoner was hoisted on the shoulders of Orangemen and carried in triumph round Enniskillen.² Such was the organization with which Drummond was confronted. In an Orangeman's mouth, "I am a loyal man" had come to have as wholly conventional a meaning as "law and order" have nowadays in, let us say, Mr. A. J. Balfour's public utterances. "When an Orange witness," said Judge Fletcher, "swears he's a loyal man, he means, 'gentlemen of the jury, forget your oath and acquit the Orangeman.'" In dealing with Orangeism, Drummond was greatly helped by the Constabulary Bill passed in May 1836, which transferred the appointment of constables from the magistrates to the Lord-Lieutenant. In the North the old mode of appointment had brought a number of Orangemen into the force, and had *pro tanto* destroyed its value as an impartial instrument for keeping the peace.

In battling with Orangeism, Drummond never hesitated a moment, and he always carried his point. When Colonel Verner, deputy-lieutenant of Tyrone and Orange D.G.M., gave as a toast at an election dinner, "The Battle of the Diamond," he wrote asking if the report was true that the D.L. had been party to the commemoration of a lawless and most disgraceful conflict. Verner replied, with the hereditary insolence of his caste, "I am disposed to think that when you put a question in a form like this you can hardly expect on cool reflection that I should condescend to answer it. . . . I am bound to decline to reply." This monstrous letter naturally brought an answer from the Viceroy, relieving Colonel Verner of his duties as J.P. and deputy-lieutenant. Drummond was equally firm in dealing with the other side. He actually caught within two years of his coming over two Ribbonmen, and that without any of the Coercion

¹ This very usual and "heroic" way of fetching their guns if the stick fight went against them is kept out of sight by men like Colonel Saunderson.

² Quite lately poor District-Inspector Martin's grave at Ballyshannon was disturbed, and the flower crosses laid on it by his wife flung away. I have no doubt an Orange jury would not merely acquit the doers of this sacrilege, but would think they had done a righteous thing.

Acts which the officials had grown to look on as essential. He was able to "scotch" the agrarian associations, partly because he insisted on energetically working the ordinary law instead of trusting to what Mr. Bright called "the ever-failing and poisonous medicine of coercion;" partly because the people at once began to trust him, and it was their favour and connivance which had given the Ribbonmen security. Sometimes his personal influence was enough to put an end to an abuse. From time immemorial drinking-booths had been set up in Phoenix Park on Sunday afternoons, and the day seldom ended without a riot. To a Scotchman this was a specially odious business, and Drummond determined that it should cease. "You mustn't think of trying," said the old Castle hands, "it's too old a custom to be interfered with." Nevertheless he rode out unattended, and argued with the keeper of the nearest booth on the brawls and fighting, and punishment that resulted from such gatherings. "It's very painful to me," he added, "and I do wish the meetings could be given up." Without even a show of sullenness the man packed up his things, went off, and never returned; the same with the rest. "The old custom," triumphantly exclaims Drummond's sister, "was given up for ever." The same with faction fights, which the gentry had rather encouraged,¹ while the police on such occasions were drawn out of sight. Drummond's influence, more even than his display of activity, discouraged and put them down. Ireland has never gone back to these childish and disgraceful contests. The change was rapid. Almost immediately after Drummond's appointment, a sub-inspector wrote to him urging the impracticability of suppressing fights at fairs and such-like. A few months after, the same official wrote, "There is no doubt if the business be well followed up for a sufficient time these disgraceful riots will presently be put a stop to." The fact is, no attempt had hitherto been made to stop them.

And Drummond was as determined that the police should not be used as tithe-collectors as he was that they should act with energy and perfect fairness in keeping the peace. At common law the sheriff had a right to claim police help, but the Lord-Lieutenant had a dispensing power, and he used it; just as in 1887, before the mortgagees' champion came into office, Sir M. H. Beach used to "put pressure on bad landlords within the limits of the law." So that in Kerry, Colonel Turner assured me, however much the squires (of whom the Colonel's opinion was much the same as Arthur Young's) might call for police help, it was never given without inquiry into the merits of each individual case. The fury of Messrs. Glascock, solicitors of the Dean of St. Patrick's, when, instead of police and troops being placed at their disposal, they were told to

¹ In Maxwell's *History* of '98, I remember "the gentry were getting alarmed because the drinking and faction-fighting had almost ceased."

"get the help of the sheriff who is vested with full power to call for military and police protection in executing his duty, His Excellency cannot consent to any direct interference," is most comic—just what Messrs. Dudgeon and Emerson would have been likely to express had Lord Londonderry looked into the merits of the Massarene case instead of giving the evictors a free hand. Drummond's rule was identical with Colonel Turner's—*i.e.*, Sir M. H. Beach's: "Police shall be sent if there's danger of a breach of the peace, not otherwise; and Government will judge if the peace is in danger or not." But it may be said, tithe was moribund, faction-fights were condemned by the growing intelligence of the people, Orangeism was under a cloud in England, owing to the now too much forgotten Cumberland-Fairman business. Drummond was sure of support in attacking these; against the agrarian societies he failed. Yes: he only scotched them because he was backed by no remedial measures in England. The wonder is that he kept Ireland quiet, nay, that he changed the feeling towards her officials from suspicion and dislike to trust, though the Whigs, always promising, actually did nothing. The Irish trusted him, and England because of him; just as now they trust Mr. Gladstone, and through him that sense of justice which they believe he has inspired in English hearts. He recognized that the evil land system was directly answerable for the agrarian societies and their outrages; and he told the landlords so. When a Mr. Austin Cooper was shot in the barony of Kilmenanagh, the Tipperary magistrates called on the Lord-Lieutenant for more protection, for a more stringent search for arms, and for a return to the wholesome practice of challenging juries. This called out Drummond's famous letter to Lord Donoughmore which that nobleman withheld as dangerous from his fellow J.P.'s—which they never saw, in fact, till, after it had been called for in the House, it was distributed in broadsheets over the county. Beginning with an assurance that the Lord-Lieutenant is taking the most vigorous measures to bring the murderers to justice, Drummond proceeds to traverse every statement in the magistrates' letter. Crime, they say, has increased, and juries have grown through intimidation less ready to convict. He brings the statistics of five years to show that both these allegations are "absolutely at variance with fact." Convictions were relatively as numerous as ever; and the testimony of Major Carter and six other stipendiary magistrates was clearly against intimidation. And then he points out that "the too rapid change from voter-breeding to improved farming" is answerable for outrages. "The instinct of self-preservation is unfortunately enlisted even on the side of guilt in vindication of what they falsely assume to be their rights. Hence sympathy with agrarian crime. . . . Property has its duties as well as its rights; and to the neglect of these duties in times past is mainly to be ascribed the diseased state of society in which crimes

take their rise." After again pointing out that the Lord-Lieutenant is doing all that can be done, without those extraordinary measures which the generally improved state of Tipperary does not call for, he leaves the rest to the faithful diligence of the local magistrates, to the beneficial exercise of their rights as landlords, and to the adoption by the Legislature of wise measures of general policy. If a lighted bomb had fallen in the magistrates' room at Cashel, it could scarcely have caused more consternation than did this letter. It was suppressed. Before the Lords' Committee in 1839, less than a year after it was received, Lord Donoughmore explained: "I told Lord Glengall the chairman: 'This is your document; but as it is addressed to me as lord-lieutenant of the county, I shall not give it up or allow it to be published under the state of excitement in which the country is.'" And in reply to the question: "Which passages appear to you dangerous with regard to the landowners?" He at once said: "The part to which I particularly objected was, 'Property has its duties as well as its rights.'" To those who have begun to study Irish politics since 1870, when the first attempt was made at remedial land legislation, when the law first faintly recognized that dual ownership which the peculiar conditions of Irish tenancy had established, the then attitude of the Tipperary landlords must seem incredible. But still the vindictive stubbornness, the cruel, in some cases suicidal, determination to resist all arbitration, to make that a war *à outrance* which in England everywhere has been settled by reasonable compromise, prove that if the Irish Protestant is too generally an ignorant and aggressive bigot compared with his English co-religionist, the Irish landlord often lacks the fairness and common sense which are usually found in his English brother.

There is little more to tell about Drummond. He made up his mind to complete, in a very comprehensive way, the Report on the Railway Commission. He wished it to be, what it is, a thorough guide to the then state of the country. But the extra work was too great a strain for him. Mr. O'Brien gives in full that part which refers to the employment, the wages, &c. The inquiry proved conclusively (he thought) that the people were idle and listless for lack of remunerative employment. Therefore he advised, along with the poor-law, extensive public works, recommending especially that the State should make railways. "It is a waste of the public available resources to suffer so large a portion of the Empire to lie fallow; or to leave it to struggle by slow advances and with defective means towards its own improvement, when judicious State aid might quickly make it a source of common strength and advantage." He was before his time. "The thing is done (he pointed out) in a colony; much more is it necessary in a part of the United Kingdom where neither the land nor the people can remain useless without being hurtful

also, and in nearly the same degree." But the Tories opposed the measure because it was brought in by the Whigs; and the whole flock of speculators screamed out against the waste of public money. Irish drainage was left to Mr. A. J. Balfour to bring in as a *bonne bouche* for the North; Irish railways became under Supply and Demand the laughing-stock of the commercial world, every petty line with its own costly staff of directors, &c., the whole thing combining a maximum of expense with a minimum of public service.¹ At the same time Drummond was prompting De Beaumont, whose book is still the best authority on the times.² De Beaumont's conclusion, "that the Whigs are carrying out and have carried out considerable reforms in Ireland, although they seem to me placed by English passion and English interests under the impossibility of doing all that the interests of Ireland require" (letter quoted, O'Brien, p. 317), is just what Drummond himself felt. Unhappily, the subsequent instalments of reform were so long delayed and so grudgingly conceded that they were received with little gratitude; and, as M. de Beaumont notes, English passion has more than once prevented the right thing from being done in the right way. For instance, the disestablishment of the so-called Irish Church gave the Government of the United Kingdom one of the grandest opportunities that have ever come in a nation's way. To have established the national religion, as the Kirk was finally established in Scotland at the Revolution, might have been impossible; and it might have had the disastrous effect of making the Catholic clergy less nationalist. But to have given a few cathedrals (what could the Protestants want with two in Dublin?), and a few sites like Cashel and Monasterboice, would have been not graceful merely, but fruitful in goodwill.

Drummond died in April 1840, having put off the holiday which every one who saw his state urged him to take. The bitterness of the Tories in 1839, no doubt told upon him quite as severely as overwork. Everything that went wrong was charged to his account. "Popery and agitation," said Shaw, M.P. for Trinity College, "are both encouraged by the Government. Drummond manages Lords Morpeth and Mulgrave, and O'Connell gives his orders to Drummond. The only way for England to save the loyal and Christian population of Ireland is by hurling Lord Melbourne's Ministry from office." One knows the old tune; it was played with few variations (the variations are always few) in 1886, and it will be

¹ Goods' charges are practically prohibitive. Cork firms find it cheaper to ship their wares to Bristol, and re-ship to Wexford for distribution in that and the next county. See some striking facts in Dr. Bowles-Daly's *Glimpses at Irish Industries*.

² I spoke of Captain Smart's novel; I cannot help noting the contrast between De Beaumont's work, which is a book, and such farcical sketches as *Chez Paddy* and its brethren. Is French intellect degenerating, or are such books written to order, and do they merely show the sort of pabulum on which "the stupid party" hopes to train up French opinion? Here again the mischief done is great. M. de Grancey is a retailer of *histoires pour rire*, which foreign gobemouches will accept as true.

played again so long as English ignorance of Irish matters makes it "go down" with a certain number of voters. What accentuated it just then was the mysterious murder of Lord Norbury (son of "Hanging Jack Toler") who was shot at the door of his castle near Tullamore. The murder was not agrarian; almost indubitably, it was like those of Lord Leitrim and Lord Montmorres, due to private revenge. But the Tories at once charged it on Drummond's letter. The *Times*, with normal inconsistency, furiously championed the landlords whom it had lately vilified. Its language surpassed in virulence that of the most rabid Irish-American print. "Instead of heartily assisting the magistrates to discover the murderers, this Jack-in-office took on himself to lecture the vast body of landed proprietors on the discharge of their duties, and to more than insinuate that all the evils they complained of had been caused by their own misconduct. . . . Whatever acts of violence have been perpetrated since that letter was published, it is not too much to say have been abetted, encouraged, and stimulated by its abuse of the gentry under the eyes of the peasantry." Lord Melbourne's Government did not lose its head. Lord Morpeth stood by his subordinate. "No amount of denunciation," he said, "will make us swerve from our course. We will do justice to the Irish people; we will uphold the law and put down crime; and we will not withdraw our deliberate opinion that property has its duties as well as its rights." They had the powerful support of O'Connell, whose speech denouncing Shaw, Conolly, Litton, and Tennent was a masterpiece of well-deserved invective. When he spoke of "the four gentlemen who, it would seem, came here for the sole purpose of vilifying their native land," he put his finger on the blot which has made Irish history so different from English or Scotch. It is impossible to imagine any four Scotch M.P.'s talking of any section of their countrymen as these four Irishmen talked of the Catholic peasantry. "Government was attacked," said O'Connell, "because it had been weak enough to show some pity for those subjected to the horrors of sanguinary evictions." Of course the attack was a party trick; Ireland has over and over again been sacrificed to the "exigences of party." This time it failed; but Lord Roden's motion for a Select Committee gave Drummond a vast amount of work and worry. He had to prove by figures that Ireland had never been so quiet for twenty years; and his figures and extracts from the judges' addresses for 1836-7 enabled Lord Normanby (Mulgrave) to crush Lord Roden, whose motion was nevertheless carried by five votes, only to be nullified by a vote of confidence in the Commons. The Lords' Committee did one good thing: it brought Drummond under seven days' examination, which proved him to be thoroughly acquainted with the working of the secret societies (though he wisely discounted the spy system, that fertile source of manifold mischief);

and in the course of which he declared his conviction that the stipendiaries are better judges of the facts in a district than the J.P.'s: "their opinions are more carefully formed, and the grounds of them more carefully examined;" and also his feeling that the police in Catholic districts should be Catholic. Nor did he limit Catholic officials to Catholic districts. On this point a letter of Sir C. Gavan Duffy to Mr. O'Brien (p. 379) is most instructive. "A certain high sheriff of Monaghan (says Sir Charles) in a freak of bravado, appointed as his sub-sheriff, with authority to empanel juries, &c., one Sam Gray, who had notoriously murdered a Catholic neighbour, but who had escaped conviction because he was Grand Master of an Orange lodge. A young Belfast barrister, O'Hagan (afterwards Lord Chancellor, the first Catholic since 1688) brought the matter before the Castle. Drummond requested the high sheriff to make another appointment. He arrogantly refused; whereupon the Lord-Lieutenant superseded him. The Protestant gentry to a man refused to serve, hoping to checkmate the administration; but the difficulty was got over by appointing a Catholic, the first since the Revolution."

Of Drummond's personal influence the immense value is proved by two considerations—he made English rule popular; and under him the police (now alas! so cordially hated) were thoroughly liked. There is no need to draw out the contrast between him and Mr. A. J. Balfour; every reader will make it. Untrained to statesmanship, and therefore without the evil traditions that such training often gives, he was simply a man of sound common sense and practical culture comparable with the "politicals" to whom our Indian Empire owes so much. To political work he brought inflexible integrity, honesty of purpose, yea, a consuming desire to do the right thing *coste que coûte*. Mr. A. J. Balfour has had a wholly different task. He was set to rigorously carry out the monstrous Crimes Act which the publication of the "fac-simile letter" helped his party to force through the House. What a pitiful figure he has not seldom made in Parliament for those who can read between the lines of a debate! Irish members have not always been temperate in speech; sometimes they have reminded us of the scene in Elia's Essay; where the stuttering little barber, scarcely able to speak he is so angry, has right on his side against the man whose exasperating calmness wins the suffrages of ignorant lookers-on. But their attacks have told, being barbed with truth. No one respects Mr. A. J. Balfour. His party praises him as "awfully clever," wonderfully good at repartee, a sort of Greek sophist, who in Irish matters is obliging enough to make the bad cause appear the good one. But this is not statesmanship. The petty triumphs of the Common Room or the debating club are beneath contempt when applied to solve great questions. No one but the blindest of Tories,

who, satisfied with "our fellows" being in, is careless about all else, can dream that anything is settled, or the slightest step taken towards settlement, by all this insolent serenity in the House, or by all the tricky bits of special pleading with which Mr. A. J. Balfour regales outside audiences. He never attempts to face any of the issues which those who have studied the question know to be all-important. He has certain axioms, every one of which goes to widen the breach instead of to heal it—*e.g.*, the Parnellites are scoundrels; to hand over Ireland to their rule would be ruinous; the League is a tyranny of the worst kind; the people are coerced into supporting it (even so it was urged that Congress "coerced" the Americans to throw off the British allegiance); the Plan of Campaign (a Trades' Union to force the landlords to grant often far less than the reductions which the Government's own Courts have granted) is sheer robbery, declared illegal both by Pope and Crimes Act; this Act invented no new crimes. Not a newsboy has been taken up under it; not an editor imprisoned. True, they have been taken up and imprisoned, but it has been for intimidation, for something or other that was always an offence at law. Such government by dialectics is very un-English; the good sense of the nation saw through it from the outset. Many have asked all along: "When Mr. A. J. Balfour makes his unwarranted statements does he speak as a Scotch landlord and therefore presumably with due regard to facts, or as a pupil of the Irish Castle, where sometimes it is thought expedient to bear witness quite independently of facts?" Drummond made the Castle do and say what he felt was right; Mr. A. J. Balfour has wholly given in to the bad old Castle traditions, nay, he has made them yet more debasing; and in this way he has succeeded in forcing the Irish to recognize an enemy in every official and to look with suspicion on every Government measure. And then, while crushing down and maligning the trusted chiefs of the Irish party, he brings in his grotesquely inadequate remedial measures—his extension of Lord Ashbourne's Act, of which the Drapers' Company takes advantage to insist on such an exorbitant price that the Land Court itself refuses to ratify the sale;¹ his Light Railways, his Bann Drainage, and now his Catholic University. As if the Irish people could be bribed with sugar-plums. They take them; when the Bann drainage was already at work by anticipation it would have been foolishly disastrous to refuse. But they take them only as sugar-plums, not at all as remedies. No; you do not win over a people by deliberately insulting them at every turn. Mr. A. J. Balfour's doctrine is what many hold in regard to Orientals: kindness is thrown away on them; force used or held in reserve is the only instrument for keeping

¹ Mr. Balfour in the House threw the Drapers over in the unkindest way, forgetting that many of his landlord friends have, though more cautiously, gone very nearly as far as the Government tried to do.

them in order. And believing this he has acted throughout in such an especially exasperating way that it is almost impossible to acquit his Government of deliberately seeking to force on some outrage and so to help to justify the monstrous indictment which Sir R. Webster has been piling up in the Courts. If only the wonderful patience of the Irish people had given way; if only there had been a few more episodes like the killing of District-Inspector Martin!

Ireland happily has not given Lord Salisbury his opportunity. "The Hottentots" have actually shown a more than Aryan power of self-restraint. They have not given the least excuse for "perpetual coercion." But though they have refused to be forced into outrage, the Irish people do not love those whom they believe to have been feebly playing Pitt's old game. I say it deliberately, no man since Lord Carhampton has done so much to make the *status quo* insupportable, to make Home Rule inevitable, as Mr. A. J. Balfour. Here, as in all else, he is Drummond's opposite. He has well served his Government, helping them first to shelve any real settlement till the date of their permanent disappearance, and next to keep in good-humour the Irish landlords whom the Tory Land Bill of 1887 had naturally disgusted. This latter work he has carried out *con amore*. A little coercion, a little brutal batoning of farmers, assembled to discuss the rent question, goes a long way towards pleasing a certain class of Irish landlords—the men whose hereditary oath, like that of the Corcyrean Oligarchs, has always been, "I will be evil-minded towards the commons and will counsel all the ill I can." And then, too, he has given them the solider satisfaction of Lord Ashbourne's Act.

His Government will ever live as the exact opposite of Lord Melbourne's. The latter was loved because, though it did little enough, it worked without coercion; the former is (and will be) hated for many reasons—not least for this that, instead of adopting the inexpensive way of Select Committee (as was done when the character and working of the Orange Society was inquired into) it went the very dearest way to work through its apparatus of a Commission, striving to ruin with law expenses a cause which Coercion had only strengthened.

In France, under the Second Empire, when politics were interdicted, talented Frenchmen consoled themselves by writing suggestive essays on Roman statesmen in which, for those who could read between the lines, the petty tyrannies of the day were exposed to merited scorn. I should not wonder if those who dare not cheer Mr. Gladstone under pain of imprisonment take to cheering Thomas Drummond. If they do not, it is not for lack of love to his memory. Because Drummond lived and worked, because Gladstone and John Morley and a few more are alive and working on his lines, therefore despite countless disappointments we still believe in England. But

there must be no more disappointments. It is no use asking men as stubborn as Pharaoh, men who cling to place and care for nothing else: "Seest thou not yet that Ireland is destroyed?" But it ought not to be in vain that we appeal to those sections of the English masses which, not having yet looked into the question, are deluded with sham Unionist nonsense and ask them for pity's sake to study Drummond's life, and then to decide for themselves whether such a man could have been so wholly mistaken as he must have been if Mr. A. J. Balfour is not utterly wrong in principle and in methods. "What do you wish?" we would ask them; "will you have an Ireland happy and contented, loving and sisterly, or will you have it as Alsace would have been had France systematically kept down the Protestants there, and finally (as your 'statesmen' would fain do on the Massarene and other properties) ousted them in favour of Catholics from Brittany or Provence? There are the two methods, Mr. A. J. Balfour's and Thomas Drummond's; it makes all the difference to the future of the United Kingdom which of the two lopt."

* A more typical Orange outrage than any I have cited is given on page 348—the firing by an Orange party into a crowd of children dancing round a bonfire on St. Peter's Eve—as we used to in West Cornwall on St. John's Eve.

Two, one a lad of ten, were shot dead. A farmer and his labourer, the former Grand Master of an Orange lodge, were taken up, but immediately dismissed.

MIRACLES AND DOCTRINE.

IN a previous article¹ we noticed some of the most obvious objections to the miraculous stories found in the Old Testament and elsewhere, and discussed some of the so-called scientific arguments offered in support of them, and at the same time attempted to show how many of them might have arisen from circumstances entirely due to natural causes. Our object in the present article is to discuss a more general objection to the miraculous as a whole and show that it presents a very insufficient basis for the support of religion. Religion is, as we understand it, a spiritual thing; it has to do with the inner life of man, with thoughts, affections, and motives; it influences conduct; its external signs are purity, love, and justice. There does not appear to be any necessary connection between religion as thus defined and miracles, which are usually supposed to affect matter in some unusual way. If the sun could be made to stand still, if water could be changed into wine, if loaves of bread could be multiplied, these occurrences would have nothing to do with human conduct or the affections and motives which influence conduct. A great religious founder is not he who could work a miracle, but he who can direct into new and higher channels the thoughts and aims of his fellow-men, as Emerson said: "Not he is great who can alter matter, but he who can alter my state of mind."

In this article, therefore, we shall consider the connection between miracles and doctrine, and endeavour to show, not the truth or untruth of miracle stories, but their inutility. If we find they are of doubtful utility, that religion has no need of them, that ethics, like science, knows nothing about them, we shall feel less anxious for their preservation, and can look upon their dissipation without dismay.

The general contention is that miracles are of doctrinal use, that they are a witness to the existence of God by his special intervention in human affairs, that they are the confirmation of a prophet's claim to be divinely commissioned, as in the case of Moses and Elijah, and that pre-eminently they are a great evidence for the special mission of Jesus in his purpose of redeeming mankind. We do not think it will be difficult to show that these propositions are not supported either by the Bible or by experience, and that Theism, both Judaistic

¹ WESTMINSTER REVIEW, August 1889.

and Christian, rests on far other grounds. We shall here confine our attention to the Christian miracles, as they have the strongest claim to attention, and if we find they do not succeed in fulfilling the conditions necessary to convince mankind we may rest assured no others will.

Attempts have been made by some liberal theologians to increase the argument in favour of miracles by stretching the meaning of the term. It can, however, hardly be honest in debate to import new meanings into well-known words, and then, on the strength of this extended meaning, to argue as if the ordinary interpretation was intended. When we speak of miracles we use the word in its well-known and long accepted meaning, and only apply it to certain alleged events which have occurred within historical limits: events or effects contrary to the known laws of Nature,¹ exceptional, extraordinary, and unexpected—the evidence for which is purely of a historical kind.² This is what has always been meant by miracles in theology.

The newer theory to which we have referred, however, includes in the term miracles all the great acts of creative energy—the beginning of the material universe, the beginnings of life, the beginning of consciousness. These are all embraced under the term miracles by the new school. But this they are not. They are beyond doubt, as far as secondary causes are concerned, perfectly in harmony with natural laws, and would always and everywhere occur when the necessary convergence of previous phenomena brought about the favouring conditions. And in every case, in the origin of matter, of life, of consciousness, the commencement once made the phenomena continue in obedience to laws which are revealed in their progress. But miracles can only occur when these orderly conditions already exist. They are departures from a normal state of order, apparently without adequate cause, and do not recur though other conditions remain the same.

Therefore they cannot be embraced in any orderly series, like creative acts, or they at once cease to be exceptional, and to absorb them into the orderly and regular category of cosmic phenomena is to say that they are no longer miracles.

The Theist declares that the origin of creation, of life, of consciousness, are valid evidences of the existence of God, but that historical miracles add no additional sanction to the belief in a creator, because if people will not believe on the evidence of the great and constant and orderly sequence of matter, life, and con-

¹ Newman's definition is: "Such events, that is, for the most part, as are inconsistent with the constitution of the physical world."

² "In 1648 an ordinance was passed in the Long Parliament by which it was actually made an offence, punishable by death, to deny that *which is manifestly only a question of historical inquiry*—the authenticity of any one book contained in the canon of Scripture."—Mr. W. E. Gladstone: Debate on Dissenters' Chapel Bill, 1844.

sciousness; neither would they be persuaded by any exceptional departure from this order coming under their own eyes.

Another theory advocated by the liberal theological school is no more consistent. They urge that miracles may be instances of the incoming of a new order of life—or of “higher forces acting upon higher laws.” That as life is an advance upon matter, and consciousness an advance upon organism, so the spiritual man able to work miracles is an advance upon ordinary mankind, and that Jesus in working miracles only exhibited a power appertaining to a certain elevated stage of life in which thought or spirit will dominate matter. But here, again, if this view were the true one miracles would cease to be miraculous, for if under the same conditions they would always recur they would come under the dominion of law. However, they cannot be said to belong to such a category, for this reason, because though life and consciousness might have appeared miraculous when they suddenly and unexpectedly arose on the surface of the previously inorganic or unconscious face of Nature, their continued and orderly persistence show them to be natural, and makes them no longer exceptional and startling; but the same thing has not occurred in the case of theological miracles. If the miracles attributed to Jesus were in a similar category we ought to have seen a race of men born, of whom Christ was only the first, in which this miraculous power was natural. It is the belief of many that for a short time it was so, and it is the belief of others that it is so still, but neither case has stood any critical, historical, or scientific test. So that we think we are justified in affirming that it is useless to attempt to rest miracles on any argument of this kind. The attempt to bring creative acts into the category of miracles is to destroy the distinction which is the basis of the argument, while to bring miracles under a higher law not yet fully understood, is simply to affirm that they are no longer miraculous.

The same defect belongs to the attempt to bring prayer into the category of miracles, simply because it does not belong to the region of phenomena. Prayer is not a sign, or a wonder, or a startling exception to the spiritual order of which it is part, but it is in its own sphere subject to its own laws; laws which with others rule in the spiritual life. It is no more miraculous for prayer to strengthen the weak and tempted, to soothe the distressed, and heal the broken-hearted, than it is for the summer sun to warm the earth or the autumn rains to fertilize it. The efficacy of prayer is a transcendental reality, not a supernatural manifestation or a miraculous effect.¹

Confining our attention, then, to those events and effects which

¹ “Lastly, answers to prayers, however providential, are not miraculous; for in granting them God acts by means of, not out of, His usual system, making the ordinary course of things subservient to His gracious purpose.”—Newman, *Essay on Miracles*, p. 67.

can legitimately be called miraculous, the question before us is—How far they can be looked upon as an evidence for the existence and intervention of God? How far they can be considered to accredit the mission of a prophet, and how far they give any sanction to the doctrine of the deity of Jesus?

We are here rather inclined to differ from Mr. Matthew Arnold when he says "that miracles, when fully believed, are felt by men in general to be a source of authority, it is absurd to deny. One may say, indeed, suppose I could change the pen with which I write into a pen-wiper, I should not make what I write any the truer or more convincing. That may be so in reality, but the mass of mankind feel differently. In the judgment of the mass of mankind could I visibly and undeniably change the pen with which I write into a pen-wiper, not only would this which I write acquire a claim to be held perfectly true and convincing, but I should even be entitled to affirm and be believed in affirming propositions the most palpably at war with common fact and experience. It is almost impossible to exaggerate the proneness of the human mind to take miracles as evidence and to seek for miracles as evidence; or the extent to which religion, and religion of a true and admirable kind, has been, and is still, held in connection with a reliance upon miracles."

We think this is conceding too much. We do not think so great a general influence can be attributed to a belief in miracles.

Mr. Arnold might have answered that he said in the first sentence of this passage "miracles when fully believed;" but that is the initial difficulty. If he turned his pen into a pen-wiper it is most probable that the mass of mankind would not believe that he did it, or would, at any rate, dispute with him or with each other as to the agency by means of which he performed the trick. It is most unlikely that any one would think more highly of his writings, or take his word for any improbable or extraordinary statement he liked to make.¹ And this is the first objection to the alleged doctrinal usefulness of miracles. They increase rather than lessen religious difficulties by asking men not only to believe in transcendental realities, but also to accept startling and improbable phenomena. If Mr. Arnold had been able to perform the miracle he describes, it would have largely, if not entirely, diverted attention from his useful teaching, would have set the unintelligent discussing the mere phenomenon, and would have made the intelligent throw aside his books in disgust as the production of a charlatan. In asking men to believe in miracles you have first of all to overcome the normal tendency to scepticism which is much more general than the readiness to believe. You must have overwhelming evidence before you can convince men of the occurrence of supernatural events, which, if

¹ "On what ground shall one, that can make iron swim, come and declare that therefore he can teach religion?"—*Carlyle*.

they could be conclusively proved, would only be doubtful evidence of the something further which you wish men to believe. Mr. Arnold gets over the difficulty by saying that if miracles occurred they would be taken as proving the truth of supernatural religion ; "but miracles do not happen."

It seems to us it may be more useful to show that religion is not dependent upon such a doubtful support, and that even if miracles did happen they are of very little utility, and prove nothing.

The miracles of the New Testament, so far from being a help to belief and a recommendation of Christianity are rather the reverse, as they constitute in themselves the principal difficulty in the way of its acceptance. Many people are saying, in these days, that the character of Jesus and the high morality of his teaching win their admiration and compel their allegiance. That the energy in the cause of righteousness shown by the Apostles, and the insight into human experience and his sympathy with human efforts manifested by Paul, all incline them to join the Christian ranks ; but the miracles are a standing obstacle. Show them that they are not necessary to religion ; that they are only of interest as history or legend, whichever in the end investigation may prove them to be ; that Christianity is independent of them and needs no such support, and you remove one of the chief sources of perplexity. We may be told that this view of miracles is in opposition to that always held by the Church, taught by the Apostles and by Jesus ; but this is a popular illusion. We do not find that converts to Christianity were originally persuaded thereunto by miracles ; we do not find they are to-day. Most of the disciples appear to have been called before Jesus is said to have begun to work miracles, and no clergyman or preacher will tell you that he ever knew a case where a convert was made to Christianity by the convincing evidence of the stories of miracles. Moral persuasion and spiritual conviction are the only means of conversion. What was Paul's opinion of miracles ? Did he base his religion or his philosophy of religion upon them ? It is demonstrable that he did not. Nothing can be more remarkable than the fact, in the face of the general teaching of the Church, that Paul never makes any mention of the Gospel miracles. He never seemed to be aware of the story of the miraculous birth of Jesus, or of any of the supernatural incidents with which the Gospels are crowded. Miracles of some kind he was not ignorant of ; there was nothing very extraordinary in it ; to his way of thinking, it was a gift which God had given to some people. Some were apostles, some preachers, some had gifts of healing, some could work miracles. But so far from the belief in miracles being a test of faith, the possession of the power to work miracles was not even a proof of Christian character, as shown in the argument of the 13th chapter 1st Epistle to Corinthians : " If I have all faith, so as to remove mountains, but have not love, I am nothing."

But was not Paul a believer in the miraculous resurrection of the body of Jesus, was he not converted by his belief in it? This is by no means so clear as many people suppose. He was converted by a conviction that the crucified one had not perished, but was alive in heaven. This was not a belief in the miracle of the resurrection of the body of Jesus from the grave, neither is it at all clear that Paul believed in that. He says in the well-known chapter of the Epistle to the Corinthians, that Jesus appeared to Cephas, then to the twelve, then to above five hundred brethren at once, then to James, then to all the Apostles, and "last of all to me also." It must be borne in mind that this is believed to be the very earliest account of the tradition of the resurrection which we have, written long before the detailed statements given in the Gospels; and, as Professor Holtzman says, "one of the peculiarities of growing legends is that the later the point of time at which our informants stand, and the more impossible it is for them to have information beyond that already given, the more they appear to know." What then does Paul's assumed evidence of the resurrection of the body of Jesus amount to? We have no reason to believe, but quite the reverse, that Paul ever saw or thought he saw Jesus alive again in the fleshly body which was crucified. According to the accounts of Paul's conversion, Jesus appeared to him in a vision, in a spiritual form, with such vividness as to convince him in his own mind that the condemnation of Jesus, of which he previously approved, was without justification, and to convert him from an enemy into a disciple. But the miracle of the resurrection of the body appears to have had no place in Paul's philosophy.

Notwithstanding the long existing impression to the contrary it may be maintained that the 15th chapter of 1st Corinthians is more intelligible if we do not believe it refers to the resurrection of the body. There is much in it which is inconsistent with that doctrine. The old-fashioned doctrine that men at the last day shall rise up and resume the identical body they had in life is indeed flatly contradicted by it. The rising from the dead must mean the assumption of the spiritual body to heaven, not the resurrection of the physical body. "So also is it with the resurrection of the dead. It is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption; it is sown in dishonour, it is raised in glory; it is sown in weakness, it is raised in power; *it is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body*; if there is a natural body there is also a spiritual body: and as we have borne the image of the earthly, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly. Now this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God."

These sayings, which are the very pith of the splendid argument and the stirring and consoling doctrine upon which Christians build their hopes of immortality, have nothing to do with a belief that the

human body of Jesus arose from the sepulchre in which Joseph of Arimathea had entombed it, and that he now reigns in heaven with the identical body which lived upon earth. The statement that Jesus had appeared to others as well as to himself made by Paul does not prove anything beyond Paul's belief that Jesus had appeared to them, not in the body, but in the same apparitional way in which he saw him on the Damascus road. Miracles then, in the sense before defined; had no part in the conversion of Paul, it was entirely a spiritual process of conviction. We only learn from the Gospel stories of the bodily resurrection that it was believed in later days by those who were prepared to believe anything about Jesus, but that it had no effect upon Paul, for in fact it was not known to him.¹

It is time to draw near the Gospel stories themselves, and note what influence the alleged miracles were said to have had at the very time of their occurrence. It is probably a vague idea with many people, gathered from some isolated instances, that the ministry of Jesus was a triumphant progress from village to village and city to city. That as he cast out demons, healed the sick, gave sight to the blind, and voices to the dumb; fed thousands with a few handfuls of bread, and stilled the angry storm, that the people recognized a divine or supernatural presence in their midst, and bowed in hushed adoration and astonishment at the works he wrought. But is this view supported by the narrative? Not at all. Where are the crowds of converts? Where are the throng of devotees? Where are the multitude of subjects. How is it that Jesus had often to hide among the hills or in the wilds from the irritated and angry populace? Why was he so often broken in spirit because of the hardness of the people's hearts? How was it, if miracles are such evidences of a prophet's mission, so overwhelming and convincing, that there was no loving, adoring, devoted throng to shout his name when Pilate said, "Whom shall I release unto you?" Judging by facts rather than by inferences, it seems that all the miracles of which we read in the earlier pages had failed to secure him a single adherent.

Does it not seem that there is more historic truth in the last sad dark pages of the story than in the beautiful but dream-like and unreal narrative of miraculous birth and childhood? That the lonely patriot and reformer, deserted and left to his fate in the hour of trial, is more true to history than the superhuman being who stilled the storm and awoke the dead? How little do all the wonders avail! This view is not fanciful, it is the story of the Gospels themselves. We cannot understand why so much stress is laid by many people on the necessity of believing in miracles, or how they can imagine that miracles, even if proved, can have any weight, or in any way influence men for good, or make

¹ *Vide The Resurrection of Jesus Christ.* By Reginald W. Macan, M.A. Williams & Norgate. 1877.

them believe in God, when we see that the very people who are said to have witnessed the miracles, who did not, according to the narrative, for one moment doubt the power of Jesus to work them, were driven into greater opposition, rather than won to repentance. How were the miracles said to have been received? We read that the fame of Jesus spread abroad, that multitudes marvelled, saying, "It was never so seen in Israel;" but the Pharisees said, "By the prince of demons casteth he out demons." On another occasion the people besought him to depart out of their coasts, and at another time they were filled with madness; and yet we are asked to believe that miracles are an overwhelming evidence of divine intervention and compel conviction.

In one case, just quoted, we meet with a fundamental and unanswerable difficulty with regard to miracles. Granted that a man has supernatural powers, how are you going to tell yourself, or to make clear to other people, whether they are derived from a celestial or infernal source? "He is in league with the devil" seems a sufficient explanation, and this is the first thought which comes up in the popular mind. This accounts for the persecution of alleged sorcerers and witches, whose supernatural powers were not called into question, but whose most innocent acts were often denounced as devilish. It was the same sometimes where exceptional powers were only due to superior intelligence; "he hath a devil" is much more likely to be the opinion than that "he is a God."

There is another instance of still more importance which may be said to be a conclusive evidence of the inability of miracles to impress onlookers with a favourable view of their supposed author, and it is a remarkable illustration of the words of Jesus: "They will not be persuaded though one rose from the dead." That is the story of the resurrection of Lazarus. This event, if it actually occurred, must have been the most startling in the life of Jesus, and one might be inclined to say that, however much men might have doubted before, this would be a final and incontrovertible manifestation of divine power, which should end all opposition and make all his opponents unite in confessing their former error and join in proclaiming him beyond doubt the very son of God. But the stated effect was the reverse. We read that some believed on him, but that some went and told the Pharisees, not in any friendly spirit, for the result was that from that day forth they took counsel how they might put him to death. That was the result of the rumoured wonder. This is all in accordance with the teaching of Jesus himself, who in this matter, as in many others, has shown himself so much wiser than his followers: "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead." The human mind is superior to wonders and portents, and conviction is not to be arrived at by their means; it is

not in that way truth can conquer; it is beneath the dignity of reason to wish for or to rely upon such supports; it is impossible for prejudice and bigotry to be persuaded by them. Moses and the prophets represented to the Jews, and may represent to us, all that is worth attention in experience and wisdom; they appeal to the judgment, and they appeal to the feelings, which are sufficient to guide every man into truth and to convince him of what he ought to do.

Theologians of the school of Archbishop Trench and Dr. Cox have helped us to a solution of the whole matter. They admit that the miracles must be proved by the doctrine and not the doctrine by the miracles; and that in the case of Jesus there is no difficulty in believing that he worked miracles, as his whole life was a miracle.¹ Either this must mean that it was a miraculous thing for him to have the power of working miracles, which is nonsense, or that his life was so superlatively and exceptionally good that it is easy to believe anything that is related of him; and this is their answer to the problem which confronted us a little while back. How can we tell whether exceptional powers are derived from above or beneath—from heaven or from hell? The answer in the case of Jesus is given in this way:—We know his power could have only been derived from God, because his life was so holy, because his teaching was so necessary and is so saving, and because he never used his powers for selfish or unworthy ends. And what does this amount to? That the miracles in themselves prove nothing. It is the solution of the whole question. The divine origin of miracles can only be accepted on evidence which is non-miraculous. It therefore follows that we must have somewhere stronger evidence than the miracles themselves. And the evidence in itself in the case of Christianity being the character and teaching of Jesus, is a higher witness to religion than the miracles which it is supposed to attest can ever be; therefore they can be dispensed with without any loss to religion. We are thus led to the conclusion that miracles have no doctrinal use or importance, they can prove nothing which cannot be proved in a much more effectual and convincing manner. The stories of them serve no purpose in promoting Christianity, they have no effect in awakening men to righteousness, they do not create in the human breast any thrill of love; and the eternal hope which abides in man is founded upon deeper intuitions which are inseparable from his life.

We find in the Gospels what seem to be and doubtless are two distinct and inconsistent pictures of the life of Jesus of Nazareth: one probably historic, the other probably legendary. According to the theory of those who believe in the miraculous, the miracles

¹ "We might insist that there is nothing more supernatural in the story of the Gospels than the character of Christ."—*Congregational Review*, August 1888, p. 755.

wrought by Jesus were an evidence of his supernatural and divine nature and mission. They should therefore have been convincing to the beholders, and should have resulted in his obtaining the mastery over the minds and hearts of his contemporaries as a step to his subjugation of mankind. This the narrative, with an unquestionable historical veracity, tells us they failed to do. It tells us that he was despised and rejected of his countrymen, and no explanation is offered of this strange failure and inconsistency. The conclusion inevitably is, that the picture of the persecuted and martyred preacher of righteousness is founded upon fact, but that the story of the supernatural being who wrought wonders is a legendary accretion.

If, as Mr. Matthew Arnold has told us, the time-spirit is slowly dissolving the old miraculous stories, and the legends are by the slow process of intellectual growth being separated from the essentials of the Gospels, we need not, as many do, take alarm at the change. We may be compelled to realize that those touching and beautiful stories of angel visits and interventions, of feeding the thousands and raising the dead, have sprung from the fond imaginings of partial biographers; that the mysterious halo surrounding the Gospel story is of "that light which *never was* on sea or land." But religion need not be dismayed; nor need we fear, as Christians, that the inspiring effect of the great example it is possible for us to follow will decay. It is indeed better that we should strive to imitate the faith and service of Jesus than that we should be content to believe in and admire powers which we could never hope to exercise ourselves. If we have lost by this way of thinking the Christ of Christian legend, and if we give up the being whose birth was heralded by angels and whose corporeal ascension to the skies was witnessed by a worshipping crowd, if we find no reality in the one who is said to have called the dead from the tomb, it is only to see more clearly and love more intensely the man who witnessed and suffered and conquered in the cause of humanity and truth—the man whose simplicity and sincerity struck conviction into the hearts of bigots, and whose unsophisticated teaching of the Fatherhood of God drew the crowds of weary and worn men and women to his side to drink in thoughts which were the water of life—whose sweet disposition and loving sympathy and tender voice soothed the very maniacs accustomed only to curses and blows; tempered the raging fever, and lifted up, by the compelling power of faith, the helpless from almost lifeless apathy and despair. And surely this is greater; to change the current of history by a spiritual and self-sacrificing life is grander than to turn water into wine or to perform many wonders before a thoughtless crowd. To have taught men to love truth and freedom and God more than their Church or party or wealth, is the most divine work done on earth.

WALTER LLOYD.

THE WORK BEFORE THE SCOTTISH UNIVERSITIES COMMISSION.

MANY who do not know the Universities of Scotland at close quarters may have wondered why it is that they lag so far behind those of most, if not all, other European countries, and why the Scottish people, though it yields to none in its appreciation of what may be called distinctively academic culture, has yet so little of it. They will be tempted, no doubt, to say that the fault must lie either with the teachers or with the taught, and will be incredulous as to all attempts to shift the blame on to any such impersonal scapegoat as "the system." Now they probably know that Edinburgh and Glasgow at least can offer such magnificent remuneration to their professors (not to speak of a long vacation lasting half the year) that they can easily secure the services of the most eminent men, while St. Andrews and Aberdeen are able to attract the most promising of the rising generation of scholars by the prospect of ultimate translation to richer chairs. The Scots professors, then, are a body of first-rate men, and it can be no want of ability on their part that is answerable for the backward state of learning in Scotland. Nor can the students be blamed for it either. The traditional anecdotes of heroic endurance displayed by Scottish students in the pursuit of knowledge under difficulties are truer to the life than such anecdotes often are, and on the whole there can be no doubt that they are just such pupils as a teacher who loved teaching would elect to have. And yet, if a young Scotsman wishes to become a scholar he has to go to Germany or England, a thing he can often ill afford to do. To account for this we seem to be thrown back upon "the system" after all, and we must surely admit that a system, if it is really very bad, or if it serves some end other than that for which it ostensibly exists, may destroy the efficiency of an institution altogether. That the system is hopelessly bad it is the object of this article to show.

The agitation for Scottish University Reform has at last met with success, tardy indeed, but, so far as it has yet gone, complete. An Act of Parliament has been passed which revolutionizes University government (a point of which we shall see the importance as we go on), and an executive commission with far-reaching powers has been

appointed to deal with the whole system. This Commission has before it a task of the utmost delicacy and difficulty, for it has to reconcile with the public good certain strong and respectable vested interests which to all appearance are incompatible with it. We shall here consider what these interests are, and show how they are alone responsible for the present deplorable state of things. We shall, however, confine our attention to the Faculty of Arts, the condition of which is always the true *nota stantis aut cadentis Academiae*, and in which the need for reform is most keenly felt.

To English ears, accustomed to hear of the complex arrangements of schools and triposes by which Oxford and Cambridge strive to adapt themselves to the most various needs, it may sound incredible, and yet is true, that in Scotland every student who wishes to proceed to a degree in Arts must pass precisely the same examinations. No allowance is made for individual differences; all have to go through the same mill. There are three "departments" in which every student must qualify—Classics, Mathematics (including Physics), and Philosophy (including English Literature). Now these three examinations may be, and usually are, taken at different times, with the result that each of the three years in the course (leaving out of account the preliminary year which may or may not be spent in the Junior Latin, Greek, and Mathematical classes) is passed in learning just enough to scramble through the examination in a single department. The successful candidate has now before him a vacation lasting for six months; he knows that none of the fragments of knowledge which he has picked up will ever be of the slightest use to him again, and so he forgets them all, a process which, it is found, can easily be accomplished in the half-year allowed for it. The unsuccessful candidate must, it is true, remember what he knows all through the summer, but next November he too will be free, and both together will recommence the same round with a fresh department. At no time is there any final test of the whole of a student's attainments, though it is evident that such a test is the only ground upon which degrees should ever be conferred. It would be instructive to find out, if it could be done, how many students could pass in their fourth year the examinations they have already passed in their second; and, in the absence of such a test, it is worth while noting that the Greek books set for honours in Philosophy are only required in a translation, though the candidates have all passed an examination which certifies that they know enough Greek to proceed to the degree of M.A. In point of fact, the Arts curriculum, while professing to be a three years' course, is nothing more than three disconnected and separate courses of five months each, and the M.A. degree need only

mean that its holder has in three successive years been brought into momentary contact with knowledge at three different points.¹ He may therefore be fairly expected to realize that there is such a thing, but more than this we cannot safely say. It is no refutation of this to point to Scottish graduates who are well-informed and even erudite; for a degree can only certify the *minimum* of knowledge necessary to obtain it.

Now this is a distinct hardship to men of real attainments. Unless they can take honours in one of the departments, their superior knowledge gets no recognition at all. And it is all but impossible for them to take honours if, as often happens, their ability in one direction is counterbalanced by distinct lack of power in others. Their time being fully occupied in acquiring uncongenial knowledge, in order to satisfy the requirements of a departmental examination, they have none left to take honours in the department in which they excel. This is why so few are able to take honours in Scotland, and is the real cause of the state of things disclosed by the following table :—

HONOURS TAKEN AT GLASGOW BETWEEN 1839 AND 1889.

—	CLASSICS.		PHILOSOPHY.		MATHEMATICS.	
	First Class.	Second Class.	First Class.	Second Class.	First Class.	Second Class.
1839-49	2	9	2	9	2	11
1850-59	1	8	2	11	3	4
1860-69	1	7	6	10	1	0
1870-79	12	12	28	17	6	15
1880-89	10	19	28	27	9	14
Total . .	26	55	66	74	21	44

It will be observed that those figures bear witness to a marked improvement within the last two decades; but even if we take the figures for them alone they can hardly be regarded as satisfactory; for they only give an average of 1·1 first-class honours in Classics, 2·8 in Philosophy, and 0·75 in Mathematics for each year. It is clear, then, that honours are not within the reach of more than an insignificant fraction of the students, and the reason of this can only be that taking honours in one subject does not dispense with the necessity of passing in the other two. A still worse result of this system is that many men of the sort described leave the University

¹ The rule that the Logic class must be taken a year before that of Moral Philosophy, and the Mathematical class a year before that of Natural Philosophy, is the only attempt to remedy this.

without taking a degree at all, though they are just the men who, in other Universities, would take the highest honours and become eminent in scholarship or science.

II.

Bad as this part of the system unquestionably is, it is nothing to what we have next to consider. That the student should have no voice in the selection of the subjects in which he is to be examined is a hardship, but that he should not be allowed to present himself for examination at all, unless he has attended certain specified classes, is nothing less than an injustice.

The classes which must be taken by every student before he can be examined for his degree are, speaking generally, seven in number. Before he can be examined in classics, he must have attended the classes of the Professors of Humanity (*i.e.*, Latin) and Greek; for the mathematical "department" those of the Professors of Mathematics and Natural Philosophy are required; while the Professors of Logic, Moral Philosophy, and English Literature must be appeased before he can present himself for examination in philosophy. No exception is ever made to this rule. Every student who seeks a degree must, whether he can get any good from it or not, attend the class of each one of those seven professors and pay to each a fee of three guineas.

From this unique regulation several results follow. In the first place, compulsory attendance swells the classes of those seven professors to an enormous size. Two hundred is by no means an unheard of number for a class in Scotland. Now, so far as lecturing goes, this is no disadvantage. The strength of a man's lungs is the only limit to the number he can lecture at one time. But if University teaching means more than lecturing, the question begins to wear a different aspect, and there are reasons why in Scotland at least it must mean much more than lecturing. The students are very young—sixteen is a common age for a lad to go to college—and they are sorely in need of such help and advice as can only be given by a teacher who knows something of the individual needs of each one of his pupils. But no professor, however eminent, can do this even for a hundred students, and so what happens is that he takes an interest in the few who are more promising, or in some way more attractive than their fellows, while the rest are left to fare as best they may. They either shut themselves up in their comfortless lodgings and work aimlessly and hopelessly by themselves, or give themselves up to a life of dissipation and frivolity. It is a painful thing to say, but it is true, that the present system which only benefits seven professors, has been the ruin of many a

young life which only wanted a little care to turn it in the right direction.¹

On the other hand, it is urged with some plausibility that there is something stimulating and inspiring about a large class. The keen competition for class honours and the sense of belonging to a goodly company engaged in a common task are, it is said, invaluable to the student who wishes to distinguish himself. This is true enough, but if we analyze the nature of this stimulus we shall see that it is not all pure gain. It is the case, no doubt, that it is more stimulating to the dozen best men in a class to feel themselves superior to a hundred of their fellow-students than it would be to feel themselves superior to twenty, but it is no less true that it is infinitely more disheartening to the dozen worst men to feel that there are a hundred above them than it would be to feel there were only a score. This "inspiring influence of large classes" is, in fact, just like the high civilization of antiquity in that it is only rendered possible by the exclusion of the majority from a share in it. The whole drama is played at the expense of the supernumeraries. And yet these unfortunates have paid their fees like the rest; they came to college to learn, not to form a background to the brilliant displays of the few who have had the advantage of a better schooling, and for whose University education they are really made to pay.

We must further observe that under the voluntary system any advantages that large classes may have would be retained. We can hardly imagine any arrangement under which a really good teacher would not have a large class, and surely no one would go so far as to maintain that there is anything particularly inspiring in a large class under a bad teacher.

This brings us to a very important point. It is clearly not impossible that a bad appointment may sometimes be made to a professorial chair, and that for more than a quarter of a century a wholly incompetent man may enjoy the sole right to lecture upon any given subject. During his whole tenure of office every student will be bound to attend his lectures, and no one else will be allowed to teach his subject within the University. Such things have happened, but even if we admit that professors are never incompetent, we must still insist that a professor may misconceive the duties of his chair, and teach what no one wishes to learn. This is illustrated by a recent controversy at Aberdeen. We need say nothing about the rights or wrongs of the question, we have only to point out that it would never have arisen at all but for the absurd regulations at present in force. What occurred was this. The eminent Professor of Humanity happens to care much for archæology

¹ It is only fair to say that this particular condemnation does not apply to St. Andrews and only partially to Aberdeen. These Universities are not situated in large towns, and their numbers are small enough to be easily manageable.

and inscriptions, and nothing for composition. The students, on the other hand, are much attached to the old Aberdonian institution called "the Version," and take no interest in inscriptions at all. Now, if only there had not existed a strict monopoly of teaching, this would have led to no difficulty. The students might have learned to write Latin prose from some one else, and the professor might have taught archæology in peace to those who cared for it. As it was, there was a great deal of friction which led to angry letters in the daily papers and the like unseemly manifestations.

Again, some professors of set purpose teach far above the heads of the majority of their class. If attendance on that class were voluntary, there could be no objection to the professor making the standard of work done in it as high as he pleased. But it is an intolerable hardship that men, who cannot understand a word of what is going on, should be compelled to attend regularly on pain of failing to get the certificate of attendance which they must produce before they can be examined for their degree.

Closely connected with all this is the disorderly conduct so common in the back benches of Scottish class-rooms. The students feel that they are not there of their own freewill, but only in virtue of an absurd regulation. They don't in the least want to hear what the professor has to say; all they come for is to get a certificate that they have occupied a certain space with their bodily presence for a certain number of hours in the year. This is deplorable, no doubt, but there is a good deal of human nature in our Scottish students, and no one who knows them can doubt that if they were more free to choose the teachers for whom they felt most respect, their behaviour would be very different from what it is now.

III.

The professors are not directly responsible for the arrangements that have been described. These are partly the growth of centuries, partly the work of the Legislature, though we must remember at the same time that they came into being mainly under professorial advice, and, above all, that their continued existence is owing solely to professorial advocacy. It would be absurd to say that the system was intentionally designed to serve the interests of the professorial body, but there may for all that be clearly enough discerned in it what Mr. Bosanquet calls a "*de facto* teleology." Nor is it at all strange that this should be so; for up to the present year the government of the Universities has been almost entirely in the hands of the professors, and all classes which enjoy privilege or monopoly in any form are prone to confuse the interests of their own order with those of the whole to which it should minister. That this is so in the case of the Scottish professoriate is rendered highly probable by the fact that

where, as at St. Andrews, the existing system is not a source of large profit to the professors, they are quite as able to see its faults as other people. Let us look a little at the position of the professors and their relation to the rest of the University.

The professorial mind seems to be incapable of grasping the distinction between a University and a College. This is not a purely English distinction, but arises wherever there exists alongside of a power to confer degrees a power of regulating the course of study which must be followed by all or some of the students reading for these degrees. In most Universities there is no body which exercises this latter power. It is only in the English Universities that such bodies have very great importance, though such an institution as the *Stift* at Tübingen would seem to be quite of the nature of a college. In Scotland the college is coextensive with the University just as till lately the colleges looked at as an aggregate were coextensive with the University of Oxford. An imaginary case will make this clear. Let us suppose that all the colleges in Oxford, with the single exception of University, were to close their gates, and that there were no non-collegiate students. The Master of University would then be perpetual Vice-Chancellor, and the college rules as to attendance at lectures would come to have all the force of statutes regulating admission to University degrees. The only way to University honours would now lie through the college. This is practically what happens in Scotland. The professors as a college prescribe a rigid course of study, which all members of the college must follow, and as a University confer degrees only upon those who comply with the college rules.

The result is that, as we have seen, seven professors enjoy a monopoly of all the teaching, and therefore of all the fees, in the Faculty of Arts. In Glasgow last year there were in that faculty 968 students, each of whom pays a fee of three guineas for every class he attends. As many attend three classes, and most at least two in each year, this gives at the lowest possible estimate a sum of £7000, which falls to be divided between seven professors over and above their salaries, which are derived from endowments and Government grants, and average about £290 each. These large emoluments¹ come chiefly, as we have seen, from the existence of a monopoly, but some part of them may be more precisely accounted for as follows:—

The twenty-second ordinance made by the University Commissioners in 1861 provided for the appointment of assistants to those professors whose classes had most obviously outgrown the powers of a single man. These assistants were to receive a salary of £100 each, to be annually voted by Parliament. It is hard to believe

¹ The incomes of the Scottish professors were made the subject of a recent Parliamentary return, the results of which may be found in *Whittaker's Almanac* for the present year.

that the Commissioners did not contemplate that they should receive in addition some share of the fees. However that may be, nothing was laid down about it, and the result is that for twenty-eight years the professors, though no longer doing the whole work of their chairs, have gone on drawing the whole of the fees. There are junior classes in Scotland for which the assistant has practically the whole responsibility, while the professor hardly ever sees them, and does next to nothing for them. It will hardly be believed, and yet it is true, that these men pay all their fees to the professor, and that the assistant who does the work cannot claim any share of the profits. Now what happens here is that Parliament votes £100 of the nation's money in order that the professor may get some one else to do his work for him, while at the same time receiving large fees for it himself. The nation pays £100 to the professor towards the tuition of these students, the balance, which is considerable, comes straight out of the pocket of the underpaid assistant, who is usually a man of high academic standing and uncommon abilities. In answer to this, it is said that the assistant has the summer classes all to himself, and may, if he is lucky, almost double his pittance of £100 in this way. This is perfectly true; but surely it is absurd to maintain that because the assistant is fairly paid for the work he does in summer, the professor has a right to payment for work which not he but the assistant does in winter. It seemed desirable to state the case of the assistants clearly, because their own mouths are closed. They hold office at the will of the professor, and are thus prevented from putting a fair account of their position before the public.

IV.

It will have been gathered from what has been said that the remedy proposed for existing evils is the simple one of allowing freedom of trade in teaching as complete as is consistent with effective control of its teachers by the University. It would be folly to underrate the importance of this reservation. A University must guarantee the capability of all who teach under its auspices. It is, however, unnecessary to insist upon this here, for there is more danger of freedom being unduly curtailed by professorial influence than of its being understood in too wide a sense.

We may establish this system of free trade in more ways than one. We may recognize the *Privatdozent* and the *Professor Extraordinarius* as is done in Germany, and this is what seems to be meant by the cry for "extra-mural" teaching. The word "extra-mural" is, however, very unhappily chosen to express this idea. It makes the teacher to whom it is applied appear a sort of Pariah subsisting upon such crumbs as he can pick up at the college gates. What we want is not irresponsible extra-mural teachers, but an

increased number of recognized intra-mural teachers with a right to use the college class-rooms and inferior to the professors, only in honorary status. The old word "regent" might be revived as a title for such teachers. Another plan is to increase the number of colleges within the University. The recent Act of Parliament grants the necessary powers for this and there are signs that they will be taken advantage of. We need not, however, go into these details at present; it will be enough if we examine the main objections which the professors have urged against the abolition of their monopoly.

It has been said that, if we introduce freedom of teaching, the competition for fees among rival teachers would lead to "cramming." Now we must always put ourselves on our guard when we hear of cramming, for it is too often a mere term of abuse directed against efficient teaching by those who cannot teach efficiently themselves. Still there is such a thing as cramming in a bad sense, and we shall assume that this is here meant. It is held then that, under a free system, that teacher would get all the fees who could furnish his pupils with the largest number of "tips" likely to prove useful in examinations. University teaching would become a form of *χρηματιστική* based upon a careful study of the "personal equation" of examiners, and the successful lecturer would be the man with a turn for morbid psychology. This is a plausible objection, but it is quite unfounded.

In the first place, it assumes that the present system of three-guinea fees must necessarily remain as it is. But it is not a law of nature that three guineas should be paid for every class, any more than that these fees should be divided between seven professors. To hear people talk, one would almost think there was some special virtue in these mystic numbers. It would be perfectly simple to make every student contribute a fixed sum annually to a tuition fund, out of which all recognized University teachers could be paid, the student to be entitled to take as many classes as he pleased. This would have the incidental effect of sparing us the present painful sight of eminent professors with their own hands raking in the dirty one-pound notes which are the most distinctive product of the Northern kingdom. A tuition fee of £10 would not be too great a burden, and would yield in the Faculty of Arts at Glasgow an annual income of about £10,000, quite enough, along with the endowments of the professorial chairs, which bring in over £3000 annually, to support an efficient staff. Out of this fund teachers might be paid in proportion, not to the number of their pupils, but to the length of their service, and salaries might be graduated from £300 to £800 a year, all possible regard being had, of course, to the vested interests of professors whose appointments were made before the year 1885, when it became obvious that a change was imminent.

But even on the assumption that the Commission should be

unwise enough not to interfere with the present system of fees, it can be shown that there would not be the same opening for cramming under the proposed free system that there is now.. At present "the professor's lectures" are in most cases the chief subject in which candidates for a degree are examined, and in all cases the professor is *ex officio* an examiner in his own subject. Now "the professor's lectures" are a very definite thing. They are often delivered year after year from the same manuscript without the least alteration. Full notes of them are handed down among the students with the more profitable passages carefully marked. These can easily be committed to memory, and, if this is done, a pass is certain. This is surely cramming in the worst possible form, and it would be impossible under a system where an examination in logic was an examination on logic, and not merely on somebody's lectures.

Again, it is said that we cannot secure the services of the most eminent professors unless we pay them salaries of over a thousand a year. This, however, can hardly be true; for an Oxford tutor, who does more work than any Scottish professor, is lucky, as things go now, if he can get £600 a year, while a German professor can be happy on £300 a year or less. No one can grudge the professors their large salaries—they are not so large as the incomes they would have made in other professions—all that is maintained is that we cannot afford to pay such a price for the excellence of the professoriate as the inefficiency of the whole University. If we cannot get eminent professors at a less sacrifice we must simply contrive to do without them. We can easily get men who are quite up to the work, and they will be of more use than the very best men in a position where they can do nothing. In any case it is evident that the Universities do not exist for the professors but for the nation, and a system which is ostensibly meant to further the advancement of learning cannot be justified upon the ground that it enables a few professors to lead a dignified and pleasant life.

CARLYLE'S PHILOSOPHY OF HISTORY.

HALF a century has now elapsed since *The French Revolution*—the earliest of Carlyle's historical works—was given to the world. This is a longer interval than that which separates the time of its publication from the notable events which it describes. America was early to perceive its merits, and preceded England in rendering to its author substantial evidences of her appreciation. "The strangest thing in literature," Carlyle said to Charles Sumner, "was his receipt of fifty pounds from America on account of his *French Revolution*, which had never yielded him a farthing in Europe, and probably never would."¹

The time has since been, nevertheless, when it would have been a difficult task for the pen of an American to do justice to Carlyle as a writer of history. We felt too keenly the grievous hurt which we had received at his hands, when our nation's life was imperilled in behalf of the iniquitous system of chattel slavery. The thoughtful portion of our reading public had cordially seconded the appreciative efforts of Emerson in his behalf. We had encouraged him to persevere, in spite of disappointments and difficulties, in his chosen sphere of noble literary activity. Yet, when we were afflicted, he poured no balm into our wounds, had for us no word of hope, or cheer. On the contrary, he belittled our aspirations, ridiculed our humanitarian impulses, and prophesied our downfall as a united people. He lived, however, to see and to confess his error. In his last will, he bequeathed the collection of books and pamphlets, which he had used in writing his *Cromwell* and *Frederick the Great* to the noble library of Harvard College. The great physician, Time, has healed the wounds which he gave us. A free, united and prosperous America has forgiven his mistake. We need no longer dip our pens in gall to criticize his work. The time has come to judge concerning it fairly and impartially, to give him credit for the high moral ideals which inspired him, and for all that is just and true in his historical judgments. Nay; has not the time also come for us gravely to ponder upon his words of warning, and to seek in his counsels for those vital thoughts which may help to guide us into the avenues of a true national prosperity?

Carlyle himself ridiculed betimes the idea that there could be such

¹ Sumner's Letter to George S. Hillard, Dec. 4, 1838.

a thing as a "philosophy of history." "Poor John Mill," he said one night to Mr. Henry James, "is working away there in the *Edinburgh Review* about what he calls the Philosophy of History! As if any man could ever know the road he is going, when once he gets astride of such a distracted steed as that."¹ This conception of Carlyle's doubtless grew out of his distrust of systems and system-makers. He detested formulas, and the set phrases whereby men attempt the systematic statement of truths. A philosophy of history he had, nevertheless, in our judgment, and not an ignoble one. In order that we may understand and rightly judge it, let us ask and attempt to answer the questions: What was Carlyle's own conception of history? What was it, in his judgment, to be an historian?

History, he said in effect, is something more than a mere chronological narrative of events. This, however correctly it may be reported, is a part only of the material from which history is made. The historian must be more than a mere annalist. The complete annals of a nation for a given period of time contain an immense number of facts, many of them irrelevant or unrelated to the historian's purpose, save by the accidental juxtaposition of temporal coincidence. It is the province of the historian to examine these facts, to select such as are germane to a proper understanding of the nation's life, and to reject such as have no logical bearing upon his subject. He must seek for the causes of things—especially for the moral principles involved in the management of affairs—and distinguish that which is superficial from that which has an organic relationship to the progress of events. He must look beneath the surface, and reveal those potent principles which become the springs of communal life and action. He must be a thinker and philosopher, as well as a discriminating annalist. He must be able to judge correctly between intrinsic and superficial greatness in the leaders of affairs; between that grace and gift of character and native power which mark the heroic master of events, and that apparent greatness which is sometimes thrust upon a man by the accident of circumstances. He must decide to what degree a great captain or ruler is the product of his times, owing his success to fatuitous conditions, and to what extent he makes his conditions and moulds his environment to his own ideal.

The historian must be gifted with wonderful patience, and an infinite faculty of steady perseverance in the face of difficulties. He must be quickly appreciative of the salient characteristics of a race, an individual, or a period of time. He must study not only the movements of armies, the actions of parliaments and courts, the more obvious interpositions of great leaders in the affairs of a nation, but he must also see and comprehend those silent causes that

¹ *Literary Remains* of Henry James.

are working in the life of the masses of the people—causes which are often more potent and far-reaching in their effects than those superficial movements which, by their glitter and show, appeal directly to the eye and the imagination. These deeper and more silent processes, indeed, are often unseen, and cannot be recorded; the healthful life of a nation, like that of an individual, is its unconscious life. The historian's function is similar to that of the physician, who must take note of the violations of this healthful order, study their causes and suggest their cure. "Consider it well," he says, "the Event, the thing which can be spoken of and recorded, is it not in all cases some disruption, some solution of continuity? Were it even a glad event, it involves change, involves loss; and so far, either in the past or in the present, is an irregularity—a disease. Stillest perseverance were our blessedness, not dislocation or alteration—could they be avoided."

To write truly the history of a nation, or the biography of a great leader of men, the historian must have a correct mental picture of the nation's past—of the soil out of which the great man and the existing social conditions have sprung. He must make due allowance for the influences of heredity, of racial bias, of climate and physical conditions, of inherited religious beliefs and social customs, upon the actions of men. He must be a student of geography, ethnology and comparative religion, as well as a philosopher and scientific observer of events. Rightly to describe a great leader of men, he must, in some sort, be as great as the character which he would delineate. Rightly to interpret the temper and movement of a time, he must be in sympathy with its *zeit-geist*—its time-spirit. He must know many languages. He must search through many volumes to verify a single fact; and when the fact is at last verified, he must not rest content, but go on to study it in all its relations—to seek for its hidden causes, and trace it to its logical results. The historian, therefore, should be a prophet as well as a philosopher and scribe. Finally, he should have a literary style so lucid, compact and picturesque, that his readers shall be compelled to attention, held resolutely to the thread of his discourse, and wisely instructed by the lessons which are shown to be the necessary inferences from the detailed progress of events. Thus, truly comprehending and interpreting the organic life of a people, the historian becomes counsellor, minister, and instructor in righteousness to all who constitute themselves his faithful pupils.

Such being Carlyle's high ideal of what history should be, and of the true function of the historian, it is manifest that a great deal which is named history, and which in the past has been regarded as history, was to him no history at all, but its veriest distortion and perversion. No one has more sharply criticized that sort of history with which we are all familiar, and which is little more than a record of Court intrigues, a celebration of those whose rule is the mere accident of

inheritance. Speaking of a current and standard history of his native Scotland, he says :—

" At length, however, we come to a luminous age, interesting enough : to the age of the Reformation. All Scotland is awakened to a second higher life ; the Spirit of the Highest stirs in every bosom ; Scotland is convulsed, fermenting, struggling to body itself forth anew. To the herdsman, among his cattle in remote woods, to the craftsman in his rude heath-thatched workshop among his rude guild-brethren, to the great and to the little, a new light had arisen ; in town and hamlet groups are gathered, with eloquent look and governed or ungovernable tongues ; the great and the little go forth together to do battle for the Lord against the mighty.

" We ask with breathless eagerness, ' How was it ; how went it on ? Let us understand it, let us see and know it ! ' In reply is handed us a really graceful and most dainty little scandalous chronicle (as for some Journal of Fashion) of two persons : Mary Stuart, a beauty, and over light-headed ; and Henry Darnley, a booby, who had fine legs. How these first courted, billed and cooed, according to Nature ; then pouted, fretted, grew utterly enraged, and blew one another up with gunpowder : this, and not the History of Scotland, is what we good-naturedly read. Nay, by other hands, something like a horse-load of other books have been written to prove that it was the Beauty who blew up the Booby, and that it was not she. Who or what it was, the thing being once effectually done, concerns us little. To know Scotland at that epoch were a valuable increase of knowledge ; to know poor Darnley, and see him with burning candle, from centre to skin, were no increase of knowledge at all. Thus is history written."

" The thing I want to see [he says again, in his account of Boswell's *Life of Johnson*] is not Red-book lists, and Court Calendars, and Parliamentary Registers, but the *Life of Man* in England : what men did, thought, suffered, enjoyed ; the form, especially the spirit, of their terrestrial existence, its outward enjoyment, its inward principle, *how* and *what* it was, *whence* it proceeded, and *whither* it was tending."

Such, the thoughtful student must admit, are the true objects which the historian should ever keep in view, such the lessons which should be drawn from the study of history. Rarely, however, has history of this ideal kind been taught in our schools, or presented to the public for their perusal. To memorize dates, and be able to repeat in order the names of a nation's rulers—to describe fortifications and battles and the machinery of warfare—to trace the superficial biographies of one king after another, while little or nothing is taught concerning the real life of the people—this, unfortunately, is what we have too often been expected to call and regard as history. The time spent in " cramming " with such comparatively worthless facts as these is worse than wasted. It is a species of mental dissipation, the practice of which is better honoured in the breach than in the observance. For emphasizing the worthlessness of such misnamed " histories," Carlyle has placed the thoughtful student under the deepest obligation.

Judged by his own lofty ideal of the true function of the historian, what must be our estimate of Carlyle's own historical work ? That he possessed some of these requirements in an eminent degree cannot, we think, be doubted ; nor is it less evident that in other

respects he fell short of an ideal standard of perfection. Chief among his eminent qualifications is his undoubted sincerity, his love of truth, and hatred of falsehood and shams. He wrote history in the interest of no party, or sect, or Court influence. He was ever a patient seeker for the fact, and having discovered it, he gave it what he deemed to be its true weight in the ordering and explanation of events. He was quick to correct even the minutest errors in the chronicles of other historians, and equally ready to admit his own mistakes in the extremely rare instances when such could properly be laid at his door. He possessed in an eminent degree that characteristic which Dr. Arnold affirms to be one of the chief qualifications of the historian—"activity for truth, and impatience of error." His impatience of error—his strong desire to convince the world that it *was* error—doubtless had much to do with the peculiarities of his literary style. This was intense, impetuous, rugged, strong, and strikingly original. It is so much a part of the man that no one, even of his most ardent admirers, has ever attempted to imitate it. He was as regardless of form and the mere elegances of expression as Walt Whitman. He also somewhat resembles our American poet in the picturesqueness and robust virility of his style; but he excels Whitman in the terseness and strength of his diction. His intense devotion to his own conception of the truth, and his hatred of shams, is in a measure off-set by a lack of that calm judicial temperament which is a necessary condition to unbiassed and impartial judgment. The heat and strength of his conviction, indeed, sometimes constituted itself a positive bias, for which due allowance must be made by the reader who would rightly estimate the character of a man, or the nature of an event, which he describes.

He had the genuine scientific quality of patience and perseverance in searching for facts. By the aid of an amanuensis and assistant he searched through from 30,000 to 50,000 uncatalogued pamphlets in the British Museum, for information concerning Cromwell and the Puritan Revolution; a collection of which, in their state of chaotic disorder, he said: "The sound of them is not a *voice*, conveying knowledge or memorial of any earthly or heavenly thing; it is a widespread, inarticulate, slumberous mumblement, issuing as from the Lake of Eternal Sleep." The outcome of his researches, however, was a voice, strong and resonant, which was heard in his own generation, and shall be heard hereafter, as long as there live descendants of Puritan fathers and inheritors of the Puritan spirit. Had Carlyle chosen to write upon scientific topics, the picturesque and poetic quality of his style would have rendered him one of the most entertaining of instructors; and his faculty of patient research would, doubtless, have made him eminent in the field of original investigation. Though he dealt largely in allegorical and figurative modes of expression, he

used them always to illuminate, never to conceal or distort the truth, thus illustrating by his use of the allegory his theory that "the allegory is always the product of certainty, never the producer of it."

Carlyle was profoundly religious, and deeply penetrated by the conceptions of philosophical Idealism. His religious and philosophical views tinged all his thought, and lent profound and pregnant meanings to the events of history as they are portrayed by his pen. History was to him an instant revelation of the Divine Spirit, working in the world and its affairs, and making even the wrath and folly of man subservient to its purposes, in the ultimate event, however great the present discord and evil. "All history," he says, "is an inarticulate Bible; and in a dim, intricate manner reveals the Divine Appearances in this lower world. . . . There is no biography of a man, much less any history, or biography of a nation, but wraps in it a message out of Heaven, addressed to the hearing ear, or to the not-hearing." The true work of the historian, he was convinced, was to make clear this message, for the enlightenment of individual men and the salvation of nations. The Deity to him was not a Being apart from the world, an "Absentee God," descending into it occasionally by fitful interpositions, but a divinity incarnate in Man—immediately present in the world and its affairs. Nature and the Supernatural was an impossible antithesis in his philosophy. He knew no such thing as "miracle," in the sense of law-violation. The one only miracle, in his conception, was the Universe—existence itself. Herein he was in agreement with our own Emerson. He often uses Fichte's phrase—"The Divine Idea of the World"—in explanation of his own thought.

Carlyle was deeply impressed by the causal relationship between events—their unbroken continuity of succession. As the present has grown out of the past, and is vitally related to it, so also, he affirmed, the future will grow out of the present. By the thoughtful mind its characteristics may thus be foreseen and foretold. Though he is pre-eminently the historian of revolutionary periods, he recognizes the fact that the world's growth is more rapid and normal when it progresses by steady and silent persistence, rather than by sudden upheavals and overturnings of the ancient and established order of things. Revolution, his philosophy recognized, is the penalty of some long persistent disobedience to the laws of healthful progress; some stagnation and interruption of the natural flow of events, through which barrier society must break by volcanic irruption. Owing to man's ignorance and perversity, revolutions cannot always be avoided. The crust of formalism must be broken. The world-spirit must have freedom to flow in the channel made for it by the changed temper of the time. The revolution, therefore, is a necessary step toward the restoration of health in the body politic.

"All revolutions," he affirmed, "are the utterance of some one long-felt truth in the minds of men."

Carlyle's insight concerning the actual diseases of society excelled his ability to detect their causes or prescribe their cure, save in a very vague and general way. Using his own illustration, we may say that he was better at diagnosis than at either prognosis or prescription. To the masses of men he says, "Do right! Get yourselves wise and strong, masters and rulers." This is his panacea for social and industrial evils. He fails to see, however, that only by becoming themselves relatively wiser and stronger can the people have either the will or the purpose to get themselves wiser rulers. He fails to perceive that the relation between ruler and people cannot be otherwise in the long run than one of similarity of character and aims, mutual consent, and mutual forbearance. This seems to us as true of monarchies as of republics. No great, wise, and noble monarch ever reigned long over a besotted and ignorant people; nor will any intelligent, liberty-loving people indefinitely tolerate the rule of a tyrant. The "silent perseverance" of a people, indicative of a healthy and natural growth of the social organism, is only possible under freedom—is for ever impossible under the iron rule of the despot.

Carlyle has been accused of want of sympathy with the poor, the oppressed, the ignorant, the toiling masses of the people; but the charge, without due and radical qualification, is not justly laid at his door. Impatient he was, doubtless, of all laziness and self-conceited incompetence; impatient, too, of those who constantly prate about their *rights*, instead of setting themselves resolutely to know and to do their *duties*. In his regard for the willing worker, however humble his vocation, he was, nevertheless, a true democrat. Sprung from humble lineage himself, he did not forget or deny his ancestry. He revered no kingship which was based solely on hereditary right. The leadership to which he bowed must be demonstrated by natural capacity and conscientious fidelity to the true interests of the governed. The only king worthy the name was the "able man;" he who could prove his divine right to leadership in the only logical way—not merely by a government of physical compulsion, but by moral and intellectual superiority as well. He says of conquest based upon compulsion: "It does not endure. Conquest, along with power of compulsion, an essential universally in human society, must bring benefit along with it, or men with the ordinary strength of men will fling it out. . . . All talent, all intellect, is in the first place moral; what a world it would be otherwise!"

It seems strange that he did not clearly comprehend that this law of conquest and successful leadership applies to that form of government which voices its mandates through the popular suffrage, as well as to the rule of the single strong man over a subject people. The government of the political "boss," or party "caucus," must

"bring benefit along with it," or "men with the ordinary strength of men will fling it out," as certainly and forcibly as they will fling off the rule of a single despot. Seeing that neither the "boss" nor the "caucus" inclines to rule any more justly than a selfish regard for continuance in power renders necessary, we may confidently prophesy that sensible and intelligent communities will in due time assert their ability and intention to get along without "boss" or "caucus," as readily as they now manage to dispense with autocratic rulers. Meanwhile, the wise and independent voter, not waiting for the slow movement of the majority, will proclaim at once his own emancipation from party dictation, and thus help by his counsel and example to liberate the majority.

After all has been said that we may justly say in the way of adverse criticism concerning Carlyle's objections to a government by majorities, he stated none too strongly a profound truth, which we of democratic America can by no means afford to ignore or depreciate. All government rests on intelligence and morality; and of no other form of government is this affirmation so virtually true as it is of representative or democratic government. We have already discovered that we cannot make wise and conscientious voters by fiat; any more than we can make paper promises to pay, equal in value to gold dollars by fiat. The southern field-hand and the ignorant immigrant are not magically transformed into good citizens by the gift of the franchise, neither would society be instantly regenerated by granting the ballot to our domestic servants and the fair women of our Fifth Avenue parlours. Nevertheless, a disfranchised class, though ignorant, may be more dangerous to the peace and welfare of a community than a class of ignorant voters. The exercise of the ballot, under due and uniform restrictions, may be the necessary condition for strengthening the moral stamina and improving the intelligence of the voter. One important function of the franchise is its educational influence. It is not to be regarded as of necessity a boon to the individual voter, but rather as a discipline, a responsibility, and a schoolmaster in the university of good citizenship. A high average of moral and intellectual ability is the only safeguard of republican institutions; and the remedy for the admitted dangers to which representative governments are exposed is doubtless to be found in extending and diffusing the means of moral and mental culture, rather than in measures of repression and fruitless struggles against the tendencies of the age. The power of a resolute, intelligent, and virtuous minority, acting independent of party dictation, to educate the average voter, and compel the parties to put forward their best men as candidates for office, under penalty of sure defeat, is a saving influence in our affairs to which critics like Carlyle appear to be wholly blind, and which we, ourselves, are only just beginning to appreciate.

Of Carlyle's three great historical works—the *French Revolution*, *Cromwell's Letters and Speeches*, and *Frederick the Great*—the first, though the least voluminous, is generally regarded as the greatest work. The latter two are quite as much biographical as historical in their character. Even the *French Revolution* is largely composed of biographical sketches and pen-portraits of the prominent actors—"inimitable living pictures" Dr. Arnold justly styles them—which lend reality and interest to what would otherwise have been a dry narrative of events; interspersed with philosophical comments. Carlyle may be said to have introduced the method, which has since become somewhat popular in oral instruction, of teaching history by means of biography. The leading events of a given period are made to cluster around the most notable personages of the time—the central figures in the moving drama. This method adds, doubtless, to the interest of the study, but has to be guarded rigidly against the dangers of partisan bias, incompleteness, and distortion of the true historical perspective.

The *French Revolution* has much of the quality of a drama or an epic poem, though in all statements of fact the truth of history is scrupulously sought and adhered to. To the reader not already well acquainted with the leading events and personages this history is not always perspicuous. It is a picturesque illumination and philosophical commentary in the trend and tenor of events, rather than a complete historical narrative. Innumerable are the personages who pass before the mental vision of the reader, sharply outlined by a few strong strokes of the pen. Many of them, doubtless, are strangers, and some will remain strangers, if we depend only on Carlyle for an introduction. Others, if the reader knows them not already, will become familiar to him, as they reappear from time to time, and are finally assigned to their true positions in the great moving drama of events. Carlyle's characterizations of persons are always vivid and striking, though not always elegant or wholly just. The homeliest phrase sometimes rises aptly to his pen, and is never rejected for one which accords more nearly with the canons of classical diction. One man is termed "a dog," another "a pudding-head;" "sea-green, lantern-jawed Robespierre" is a familiar figure, and the artist, David, is described as "A man bodily and mentally swoln-cheeked, disproportionate, flabby, large instead of great, weak withal, as in a state of convulsion, not strong as in a state of composure." The French people are represented as "ruffling up like a red-guggling turkey-cock." Of the turgid oratory of the revolutionary period, Carlyle says, apologetically: "Pity thy brother, O son of Adam! The angriest frothy jargon that he utters, is it not properly the whimpering of an infant which cannot *speake* what ails it, but is in distress, clearly, in the inwards of it; and so must squall and whimper continually, till its mother take it, and get it to sleep!"

As in his other historical works, Carlyle commences by looking backward upon the nation's past; and on the condition of affairs thus delineated as a background, he draws his historical word-pictures with rapid and masterly strokes. The striking episodes of the time are so described that the scenes are brought vividly before the reader, and his interest and attention are compelled from the first page to the last. The thoughtful reader, however, often wishes that the historian had given us something more of direct insight into the actual ideas and motives of the men who were the chief actors in these events: some true report of those fiery debates in Convention and Assembly—such written statements as the leaders of the Revolution left in letters and journals—something more than his own judgment, expressed in an occasional striking phrase, repeated again and again, and thus made to qualify and characterize the motive and intention of the person described, in such a manner as to distort, perhaps, his true purpose, and exaggerate or minimize his actual influence on affairs. Carlyle is sadly lacking in historical perspective. He sometimes dwells with painful minuteness on details of personal description or events of little importance to the narrative. His judgments of persons are occasionally so prejudiced or exaggerated that the portrait becomes almost a caricature. He is more successful in portraying the features and external appearances of men, than in furnishing materials for the formation of a true judgment concerning their actual moral characters. Some writers—Buckle, for example, and Hume, and Gibbon—furnish us with a corrective of their own mental bias in the accuracy and fulness with which they state all the facts. Carlyle does not always do so. He is in earnest, first of all, to impress his own conclusions on the mind of his reader, and the reader must trust to a wide acquaintance with the literature of the time to enable him to give due weight to the judgments and conclusions which are set before him. Carlyle evidently has his favourites, whose virtues he exaggerates, and his *bêtes noires*, whose vices and weaknesses he is never tired of setting forth with every embellishment of apt and forceful epithets. Had Robespierre possessed the physical presence and personality of Danton, Carlyle's judgment of the two men might perhaps have been reversed.

Nevertheless, the *French Revolution* is an epoch-making book—one of the greatest, doubtless, that this century has produced. It has revolutionized, or greatly modified, the judgment of English speaking peoples concerning the historical events of which it treats. Carlyle has given us the most readable as well as the most truthful estimate of the causes and essential characteristics of that remarkable social upheaval that we can find in our English tongue. He has silenced for ever, for all thoughtful, unbiassed, and progressive minds, the prejudiced judgment of those writers who can see nothing but evil in the French Revolution, and have nothing but condemna-

tion for its actors. He has shown that it had its logical causes in the corruptions and injustices which prevailed in France before the revolution, and which the Ancient Régime lacked both the will and the power to correct. The occurrence of the revolution was therefore a moral necessity. Carlyle portrays unsparingly the horrors of the Reign of Terror, but notes the fact that the four thousand victims of the guillotine were but a bagatelle to the number of those who perished in the Seven Years' War, which was morally indefensible, or the contests of Napoleon. In periods such as he describes, there is little difference to the fine moral sense between the guillotine and the cannon-ball; and the time will doubtless come when we shall regard all war with the same horror which the thought of anarchy now induces in our minds.

Carlyle calls attention to the fact that fifty years ago, when his history was written, there were more than 4,000,000 landowners in France; whereas a half-century earlier, prior to the revolution, the soil was monopolized by a few inheritors of feudal estates. He fails, however, to describe with sufficient clearness the means by which this great and beneficent revolution was effected, save as it followed indirectly from the confiscation of the domains of the aristocrats by the revolutionary tribunal. His study of the land question, in the practical phases which it presented in France and in Ireland, appears to have led him to conclusions similar to those which have been announced by Herbert Spencer¹ and Henry George, involving, in effect, a denial of the right to private ownership in land.

Carlyle doubtless exaggerated the influence of the great man or hero on the world's affairs, and failed to recognize clearly the obverse fact that the hero is himself the product of antecedent conditions, and finds his opportunity in his providential or fortuitous relation to the circumstances of his time. We are prone to exaggerate the abilities and virtues, while we ignore the faults, of men who come "in the fulness of time," and give voice and leadership to the tendencies of their age. Carlyle succumbs to the temptation to magnify the hero at the expense of his circumstances, as readily as do the unthinking multitude; only, with him, the hero must be a real man—no sham hero—a strong, clear-sighted, brave-hearted worker, quick to see and powerful to seize his opportunity.

It was Carlyle's defect of mental organization, notwithstanding his theoretical recognition of the continuity of events, that he could see only the individual, and had no adequate conception of humanity as an organism, working out its own salvation through conflict, and in spite of the sins and errors of individual men. He appears, indeed, to have had occasional glimpses of this sublime conception

¹ In *Social Statics*.

when under the direct influence and inspiration of Goethe—as in the essay on “Characteristics,” and certain passages in *Sartor Resartus*; but his natural bias was essentially individualistic. He believed in an *over-ruling* rather than an *in-ruling* Providence. The conception of evolution as a universal characteristic of social development, had he been able to receive it, superadded to Goethe's thought of the World as “a great, immortal individual, steadily working out the necessary,” would have corrected some of his erroneous and pessimistic judgments of men and of the tendencies of his time. Mr. Henry James says truly: “He had no belief in society as a living, organizing force in history, but only as an empirical necessity for the race.”¹ His confidence in an over-ruling Providence, and in the ultimate triumph of the good, withheld him from that absolute pessimism into which his temperamental tendencies would otherwise have led him; but he could see nothing but anarchy and evil in the popular and democratic movements of his time. Doubtless his study of Plato, to which he was led by Emerson,² somewhat influenced his distrust of democracies; at least, it confirmed and exaggerated prior convictions concerning the character of these popular tendencies. “The voice of combined men,” he said, “is the greatest a man encounters among the sounds and shadows which make up this world of time.” This voice, however, is but the multiplication of individual foolishness and stupidity, leading headlong to social chaos, unless it is inspired and directed by some wise and powerful natural leader of men. This incapacity to view humanity as an organism, to recognize the influence and importance of tendencies constantly at work in the humbler ranks of the world's workers, constitutes the most serious limitation of Carlyle's judgment as a philosophical historian. This defect grew upon him in his later years, and is most noticeable in his latest and most pretentious historical work, his *Frederick the Great*.

Though Emerson characterized this work as “infinitely the wittiest book that ever was written,” and Professor William T. Harris says that it “must altogether precede every history yet written as a complete study of the genesis and mature development of one of the greatest powers in the world,” it by no means appears to us to be the greatest—except in length—of Carlyle's historical writings. Professor Harris speaks doubtless from the standpoint of the Hegelian philosophy of history, which is essentially autocratic and anti-republican, rather from that of the impartial critic. The *Frederick the Great*, while it exhibits the remarkable qualities of patient investigation, and great accuracy of detail, which everywhere characterize Carlyle's historical studies, also illustrates in an exag-

¹ *Literary Remains*.

² Vide Carlyle: “Emerson Correspondence.”

gerated degree his defects. Lowell, commenting on this work some years ago, described one of these defects in pregnant phrase: "He (Carlyle) sees history, as it were, by flashes of lightning."¹ Certain episodes are illuminated with wonderful distinctness and minuteness of portraiture, while other phases, perhaps equally important, and essential to a complete understanding of the progress of events, are only dimly adumbrated, or are left wholly in darkness. The portrait of Frederick is brought out in every detail, but with somewhat exaggerated excellence of feature and character. Battles are described with wonderful accuracy and minuteness. With characteristic faithfulness, Carlyle visited Germany twice, and personally inspected the battle-grounds to insure absolute fidelity of description. The Seven Years' War forms the burden of this history, while the twenty-three years of peace, wherein the statesman-like qualities of Frederick's mind are most clearly developed, are passed over slightly, as of but little relative importance. In dwelling so exclusively on military operations, at the expense of the vaster movements of the nation's social, economic, and intellectual life, Carlyle sinned grievously against the ideal veracity of the historian. To this defect he was doubtless somewhat blinded by his theory that the event which can be described must necessarily be some disruption of the continuity of the natural flow of a nation's social and political life; but he could not have been wholly unaware of it, since no one has more strongly affirmed that eras of violence and revolution constitute the least healthful and significant part of the life of societies and states. A clear judgment can hardly fail to discern in the sentiment of nationality pervading the German people, of which little note is taken in Carlyle's work, an influence at least as powerful in promoting the success of Frederick's plans, as the perfection of his military drill, or the strength and wisdom of his own leadership.

In spite of all defects, the unbiassed critic must admit that Carlyle has rendered services of the greatest import to a just understanding of those revolutionary eras of which he has treated. His *Cromwell* was a work of love, and created a revolution in popular sentiment as great as that produced by the *French Revolution*. His philosophical comments, biassed though they were by an unfortunate lack of sympathy with the popular tendencies of the time, offer many wise and thoughtful considerations which we cannot too often call to mind or too seriously ponder. His criticism of the self-consciousness of an age—its persistence in urging its claims to progress, and superiority to the past—in which he saw evidences of social disease, is not without force and reason. The healthy processes of national as of individual life, he says, are the unconscious processes. A vivid perception of these processes is a symptom of disease. In following out

¹ *My Study Windows. Collected Essays.* By James Russell Lowell.

this thought, however, in the treatment of historical subjects, he has gone to an undue extreme. We must feel that the ideal historian would dwell less upon the morbid anatomy and therapeutics of history, and tell us more concerning that free, healthy, and natural life of society, which is indicative of the highest civilization, and most rapid progress in national development. Carlyle's philosophy of history places the emphasis on individual character—attempts to bring all events to a moral focus. Those events which, according to his judgment, refuse thus to focus themselves, he rejects or slurs over as of little account. He takes little note of the influences of climate, religion, the state of culture, or the physical environment. The laws of political economy, the material progress of a nation, the great popular movements for social reform, receive but slight recognition in his pages.

This, we can but feel, is a mistake, even from the standpoint of ethics. It arose largely from his failure to perceive the solidarity of society, which he recognized only as a mass of individuals, whose sole cohesive bond was the authority of individual leadership. There is, nevertheless, a truth in this view of the question as well as in the contrary view. The spirit of Carlyle's historical treatment should duly temper and modify the opposite tendency of Buckle and writers of his school. The causes of the decay of nations are to be sought in the characters and habits of individual men, rather than in the physical conditions of their environment. The *centre-stance* is greater than the *circum-stance*. The descendants of the Aryan tribes who peopled Europe manifest widely different characteristics from their Asiatic cousins in Persia and India. Who shall say that these differences are due wholly to the effects of climate and physical surroundings? Must we not rather pre-suppose an original endowment of restless, unconquerable energy in those tribes which pushed westward across barriers of sea and mountain, and became the daring explorers and conquerors of two continents? It is characteristic of Carlyle's thoroughness of scholarship that he traced the ancestors of the Teutonic people to the shores of the Black Sea, and discovered in their language words of Sanskrit relationship, indicating their Oriental or Asiatic origin, long before this now-demonstrated ethnological fact was generally accepted by scholars of recognized authority. The London *Spectator* of the time, commenting on this theory of Carlyle's, discredits it as visionary and wholly improbable.

In conclusion, what vital word of counsel and just warning has Carlyle for America, and for the circumstances of our present time? He has this word; we believe, which was spoken originally for France, but which is to-day full of significant meaning for the entire civilized world. We, in America, at least, with our venal legislatures, our partisan Civil Service, our purchased honours in social and

political life, have abundant need to hear and heed it before it is too late :—

“Aristocracy of Feudal Parliament has passed away with a mighty rushing; and now, by a natural course, we arrive at Aristocracy of the Money-bag. It is the course through which all European societies are, at this hour, travelling. Apparently a still baser sort of Aristocracy! An infinitely baser, the basest yet known.

“In which, however, there is this advantage, that, like Anarchy itself, it cannot continue. Hast thou considered how Thought is stronger than Artillery-parks, and (were it fifty years after death and martyrdom, or two thousand years) writes and unwrites acts of Parliament, removes mountains, models the world like soft clay? Also, how the beginning of all Thought worthy the name is Love; and the wise head never yet was without, first, the generous heart? The Heavens cease not their bounty; they send us generous hearts into every generation. And, now, what generous heart can pretend to itself, or be hoodwinked into believing, that Loyalty to the Money-bag is a noble Loyalty? Mammon, cries the generous heart, of all ages and countries, is the basest of known Gods, even of known Devils. In him what glory is there that ye should worship him? No glory discernible, not even terror: at best detestability, ill-matched with despicability! . . .

“Meanwhile we will hate Anarchy as Death, which it is; and the things worse than Anarchy shall be hated *more*. Surely, Peace alone is fruitful. Anarchy is destruction; a burning up, say, of Shams and Insupportabilities; but which leaves Vacancy behind. Know this also, that out of a world of Unwise nothing but Unwisdom can come. Arrange it, Constitution—build it, sift it through ballot-boxes as thou wilt, it is and remains an Unwisdom—the new pay of new quacks and unclean things, the latter end of it slightly better than the beginning. Who can bring a wise thing out of men unwise? Not one.”

(Copyright.) LEWIS G. JAMES, U.S.A.

THE UNITED STATES' ARMY.

PERHAPS after all, if impolitic and indiscreet, Lord Sackville West's letter contained nothing but the truth. Unfortunately, the American people love theatrical effects, even in politics, just as their public Press teems with private scandals which our leading organs never admit into their columns unless they have been brought to light through the medium of the law courts; while they are highly gratified—a certain portion of them—to learn that their Government has given “John Bull a slap in the face,” no matter how rudely. Men, however, who understand these matters, know perfectly well, and knew from the outset, that President Cleveland by his hasty conduct only meant to gratify the anti-English feeling which ran high among a certain section of the people, chiefly in New York, just as they were aware that the rejection of the Fisheries Treaty, and the subsequent threats which were hurled by certain irresponsible persons at the British nation, were all part and parcel of the same business. The fact is the American nation can no more afford to quarrel seriously with us than we can with them; and it is a very difficult matter to determine which, supposing such a folly as the declaration of open hostilities to be perpetrated, would come out of it the least damaged in national credit.

With Europe in its present unsettled state, the American people feel they can afford occasionally to play a high game with us; for they know we are at present too fully occupied in trying to make peace between our neighbours across the Channel, to say nothing of the very serious affairs even nearer home, to take them in earnest always, though they often seem to delight in making matters decidedly awkward and unpleasant for us. Truly, it would be a terrible and wicked, not to say foolish, war, which should arise between England and America; for, considering the vast size of the latter, her isolation, her mixed population—being the asylum for refugees and emigrants from all countries—her enormous wealth, derived from industries which in some States seem to be only in the early stages of their development, one might ask what satisfaction we should derive, since to exterminate or annex this vast continent is equally impossible, except to cause havoc and bloodshed in her large towns, and so far injure that commerce which is literally feeding our own people? A paltry advantage truly, granted that our arms were

everywhere victorious ; while, on the other hand, supposing, after a ruinous expenditure of money, we were forced to retire beaten, or leaving the issue doubtful, not only should we be compelled to look with shame on the blood and treasure so recklessly wasted, not only should we drift into a very small Power indeed, but we should immediately place ourselves and our vast colonies at the mercy of other Powers, only too ready to break the neck of our own, leaving them to divide the spoils. .

But whether or no Canada will submit to dictation by the Government of the United States remains to be seen. It is just possible the latter may assert her claims, or supposed claims, in more emphatic terms than she has yet done, relying always on assistance forthcoming from the mother country ; for there is no denying the fact that the major portion of the population of Canada already consider they have been very badly used. This, indeed, is our great danger, and what would be the outcome of a war between two such neighbours, one of whom would inevitably look for our support, even though she should beforehand reject our advice, remains to be seen.

Whether such a deplorable state of affairs will ever exist as that the Canadians, forgetting our dangers at home, shall, as their resources develop, break away from us for the purpose of avenging alleged wrongs they have suffered, or may be called upon to suffer at the hands of their neighbours, and then, finding themselves unable alone to cope with their enemies, appeal to us for help, remains to be seen ; at any rate, it will not be unwise to look from time to time at the state of preparedness in which the Americans are to be found when the gauntlet of defiance is hurled at us, or when they go out of their way to use language which is calculated to provoke irritation and retaliation on our part.

No doubt the sense of security which the United States have of late years enjoyed accounts for their standing army's numbering barely twenty-eight thousand men ; and these, except to quell slight outbreaks among the Indians, have, since the Rebellion, been but little needed. Of course it was thought possible that the day might come when the North and South would have to fight their battles over again : but of later years a better understanding has been established between these two divisions of the empire ; and a strong and increasing disposition among the white population to accord to their coloured brethren those self-same rights and privileges that they themselves enjoy has become the surest guarantee of tranquillity and contentment. Still, recently, the Government have grown alive to the fact that they must perforce strengthen their number of fighting men, and make them more efficient in the arts of the soldier, so that they may be prepared for any emergency.

It must not be supposed at the outset that the regular army of the United States, consisting of not quite 28,000 men, comprises all

her fighting strength. In addition to these there are State troops—a sort of militia supported by each State—besides an available volunteer force in case of emergency. These are naturally in point of numbers a very formidable body of men, and for the most part quite as well drilled as the regulars, though they only come up at stated intervals, and are regarded as “civilians.” Indeed, for the matter of that, there are many thousands who belong to no military body, who, in case of siege, could take their part in the work of self-defence.

The annual report of the organization of the army of the United States, published last year, shows a grand aggregate of 27,791, out of which there must be reckoned the large number of 2151 commissioned officers and 5629 non-commissioned officers, trumpeters, and clerks, &c., leaving only 17,220 privates. Of the commissioned officers the report states that there are 562 commissioned officers belonging to the general staff, 432 to the cavalry, 280 to the artillery, and 877 to the infantry; ten regiments of cavalry, each containing 600 enlisted men, or a total of 6000; five regiments of artillery, each containing 353 enlisted men, or a total of 1765; twenty-five regiments of infantry, each containing 360 enlisted men, or a total of 9000; 295 enlisted men and 160 Indian scouts brings up the grand aggregate to the number above mentioned.

Three very important points strike one in carefully perusing the report and considering the numerical strength of this army. First, the extraordinary proportion of commissioned and non-commissioned officers to privates; second, the large number of officers and men who are attached to no regiment whatever, but are employed in the general management; third, the vast expenditure which is absolutely unavoidable in the working of such a system, hardly to be credited in the poor results which accrue therefrom in a military point of view.

Apart from the “general officers”—namely, 1 lieutenant-general, 3 major-generals, and 6 brigadier-generals—whose duty it is to superintend the entire forces, there are to be reckoned the *Adjutant-General's Department*, to which are assigned 1 brigadier-general, 4 colonels, 6 lieutenant-colonels, and 6 majors; the *Inspector-General's Department*, requiring 1 brigadier-general, 2 colonels, 2 lieutenant-colonels, 2 majors; *Judge Advocate-General's Department*, with 1 brigadier-general, 1 colonel, 3 lieutenant-colonels, 3 majors; the *Quartermaster's Department*, with 1 brigadier-general, 4 colonels, 8 lieutenant-colonels, 14 majors, 30 captains; the *Subsistence Department*, with 1 brigadier-general, 2 colonels, 3 lieutenant-colonels, 8 majors, 12 captains; *Medical Department*, with 1 brigadier-general, 6 colonels, 10 lieutenant-colonels, 50 majors, 91 captains, 34 first-lieutenants; *Pay Department*, with 1 brigadier-general, 2 colonels, 3 lieutenant-colonels, 29 majors; *Corps of Engineers*, with 1 brigadier-

general, 6 colonels, 12 lieutenant-colonels, 24 majors, 30 captains, 26 first-lieutenants, 10 second-lieutenants; *Ordnance Department*: 1 brigadier-general, 3 colonels, 4 lieutenant-colonels, 10 majors, 26 captains, 10 first-lieutenants; *Signal Corps*: 1 brigadier-general, 16 second-lieutenants; post chaplains, 30. In other words, the general staff officers are as follows: 1 lieutenant-general, 3 major-generals, 16 brigadier-generals, 30 colonels, 55 lieutenant-colonels, 146 majors, 189 captains, 70 first-lieutenants, 26 second-lieutenants, and 30 post chaplains. Besides these, employed in the above departments, are 1 battalion sergeant-major, 1 battalion quartermaster-sergeant, 222 sergeants, 141 corporals, 8 musicians, and 947 privates.

Coming down to the rank and file, or to the composition of regiments and companies, there are assigned to each regiment of cavalry—1 colonel, 1 lieutenant-colonel, 3 majors, 12 captains, 1 adjutant, 1 regimental quartermaster, 12 first-lieutenants, 12 second-lieutenants, 1 chaplain, 1 sergeant-major, 1 quartermaster-sergeant, 1 chief musician, 1 saddler-sergeant, 1 chief trumpeter, 12 first-sergeants, 60 sergeants, 48 corporals, 24 trumpeters, 12 saddlers 12 waggoners; each of the five regiments of artillery muster—1 colonel, 1 lieutenant-colonel, 3 majors, 12 captains, 1 adjutant, 1 regimental quartermaster, 24 first-lieutenants, 13 second-lieutenants, 1 sergeant-major, 1 quartermaster-sergeant, 1 chief musician, 2 principal musicians, 12 first-sergeants, 52 sergeants, 48 corporals, 24 musicians, 12 waggoners; each of the twenty-five regiments of infantry contain—1 colonel, 1 lieutenant-colonel, 1 major, 10 captains, 1 adjutant, 1 regimental quartermaster, 10 first-lieutenants, 10 second-lieutenants, 1 sergeant-major, 1 quartermaster-sergeant, 1 chief musician, 2 principal musicians, 10 first-sergeants, 40 sergeants, 40 corporals, 20 musicians, 10 waggoners.¹

From the foregoing analysis, it will be seen that there is one commissioned officer to every eight privates, and one non-commissioned officer to every five privates of the cavalry, and to every four of the artillery and infantry. And when the number of men employed on "extra duty," who receive "extra pay," is taken into account, one readily perceives what an expensive institution the army of the United States really is.

Nor is this all. Though it is difficult to see how it could be prevented, we have to remember the enormous stretch of ground over which this small army is spread out, the number of posts or military stations which have to be kept up for the convenience of the troops, and the constant change from place to place which the latter undergo, to say nothing of the inconvenience wrought by the different climates in the various districts in which the troops are

¹ The above figures show the full strength of the army with all its regiments complete. Besides these there are a vast number of civilians employed as clerks, teamsters, blacksmiths, general jobbers, &c.

distributed, affecting the accoutrements and preventing uniformity in the matter of discipline. Thus, we find the map for military purposes is divided into three parts, known as (1) the Division of the Atlantic, (2) the Division of the Missouri, (3) the Division of the Pacific. *The Division of the Atlantic*, or "the Department of the East," comprises the New England States, States of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Louisiana, Arkansas, Mississippi, Alabama, Kentucky, Tennessee, Ohio, Michigan, Wisconsin, Indiana, and Columbia, containing in all twenty-seven military posts or forts. *The Division of the Missouri* is subdivided into four departments—viz., (1) the Platte, (2) Dakota, (3) the Missouri, (4) Texas. The department of the Platte comprises the States of Iowa and Nebraska, the territories of Utah and Wyoming, and part of the territory Idaho, containing thirteen forts; the department of Dakota comprises the State of Minnesota and the territories of Dakota and Montana, containing twenty forts; the department of the Missouri comprises the States of Missouri, Kansas, Illinois, and Colorado, and the Indian Territory, containing thirteen forts; the department of Texas comprises the entire State of Texas, containing thirteen posts. *The Division of the Pacific* is subdivided into the departments of (1) California, (2) Arizona, (3) Columbia. The department of California comprises the States of California and Nevada, containing nine forts; the department of Arizona comprises the territories of Arizona and New Mexico, containing twenty-one forts; the department of Columbia comprises the State of Oregon, and the territories of Washington, Idaho, and Alaska, excepting so much of Idaho as is embraced in the department of the Platte, containing nine military posts.

Partly owing, doubtless, to the vast territory of the United States, this army in proportion to its size is the most expensive institution of its kind in the world. America has certainly no right to laugh at "the war scare" which appears to frighten our own countrymen—or, better said, "the English military and naval unreadiness"—when we find, in the report of her late General Sheridan for 1887, the following remarkable passage: "Although this country has increased very greatly in population and immensely in wealth, it has become by far the feeblest in a military sense of all the nations called Great. Population and wealth do not constitute military strength. They are only the elements from which military strength may be developed in due time and by appropriate means. They are like the fat of the over-fed giant, which may be converted into muscle in due time by appropriate training. But it is too late for the giant to commence training after he has met his well-trained antagonist." And, after deploring that "this country has even left its old defences to fall into decay," there follows this still more

remarkable passage: "In a sense it may be said, without exaggeration, that the United States have no fortifications, no armament, no army, no militia, no arms, and no preparation whatever to resist successfully an attack from any first-class military and naval Power."

So that the results produced by the exorbitant outlay voted annually by the Congress of America for keeping up her standing army are immeasurably worse in proportion than those of England. Possibly much of this state of things arises from the same cause as does the inefficiency of the British army and navy, for the report speaks of "the notoriously bad system of military administration inherited from Great Britain, and characterized by excessive centralization," under which "the Commander-in-Chief of the Army, provided by the Constitution, and the subordinate commanders assigned by him to command the army and the several geographical divisions and departments, are practically superseded by the chiefs of Bureaus of the War Department," and by which "the orders of the general commanding the army, involving the most important military operations, may be practically annulled at any moment by orders to his staff officers respecting the transportation or supplies, or even the *personnel* of his command, coming to them from their staff superiors in Washington, and without the knowledge of any military commander." The complaint here made of the evils accruing from such centralization in military administration, causing stagnation and paralysis of its members, overwork and consequent disease of the central organ of the system, culminating in complete failure when subjected to the strain of war, is one which seems to have been made by nearly all the eminent generals who have commanded armies in that country, but, serious as it undoubtedly is, Congress seems very loth to remedy it. The theory that it is absolutely indispensable to the efficiency of an army that governmental control over the military administration be exercised through its skilled military officers seems plausible enough; for, as the system now stands, both in the United States and in this country, the Secretary for War, a mere civilian, may overrule what are deemed most important orders respecting the discipline of the troops, and decide, contrary to the opinion of well-trained experts, the most momentous issues respecting the armaments in times of peace, or of field movements in times of war. In the opinion of the late General Philip H. Sheridan, who held very strong views on this subject, the staff should "be the eyes and ears of the commander," to give him information, but they should not be permitted to usurp the functions of judgment in respect to military operations any more than in respect to the administration of justice. It is thought, however, now that a Republican President has been elected who is himself a soldier, and when there is probably less need for the proposed change, that the administrative affairs of

each military organization will be entrusted, as far as possible, to its own officers, subject, of course, to inspection and correction by the central authority ; and the more responsible officers are jubilant over the triumph of General Harrison at the polls, pretending to foresee a certain prospect of placing the army on a more solid and practical footing, of improving the national defences, and of introducing reforms in the habits and requirements of the soldier calculated to make him more what he is intended to be. Whether or no the new President will be able to verify all these predictions which the zealous ardour of the generals of the army have uttered concerning him, and whose election they seem to have fought hard to secure, remains to be seen.

Another very remarkable passage occurs in this last and manly statement of the late general. After questioning the alleged economy apparent in the policy of leaving entirely to other nations the expense attending the experimental development of improved means of attack and defence, in the hope of finally profiting by the knowledge which others have gained, the report states that "American genius has originated a large proportion of the modern improvements in the materials of war, while American policy has driven the products of that genius from their native country, and placed them in the hands of other nations who may at any time become her enemies." This seems to be exactly the case with British policy, the evils of which were pointed out so clearly by Charles Dickens in *Little Dorrit*, and by others better qualified to determine, by reason of their early scientific education and life-long study ; and the true cause of the national scare which has spread over the whole of Her Majesty's dominions for months past, is the relegating to inexperienced men, insensible to everything but their own self-importance, the management of our military and naval affairs, including the direction of the construction of the national means of defence. It is to be hoped, however, that we are not yet so badly off in this respect as to have to deplore, like the late American general, almost on his deathbed, that we are fast losing "by disuse the mechanical skill necessary to make available the scientific knowledge appropriated from other nations, and will soon be entirely without the plant which is indispensable to the commencement of such work"—i.e., the work of constructing fresh fortifications where necessary, and of repairing the old defences fallen into decay.

We have hardly had time to judge whether General Schofield will succeed in rousing Congress from the state of lethargy into which it had fallen. Since he assumed command of the army, however, he has decidedly effected a great change, and, judging from his report, the army not only has wonderfully improved in efficiency, but seems at last as if it were really about to be placed on a more solid footing than it has been for a number of years. Hence, in contrast with

the previous year, it is pleasant to read from a military point of view that

"The system of practice of the artillery with heavy sea-coast guns has been steadily developed, and is now to be adopted, with the approval of the War Department, for the entire sea coast of the country. The zeal and efficiency displayed by officers and men, and the progress already made, give ground for confidence that the troops will be fully prepared to handle, effectively, the weapons of modern construction, and of the largest calibre, as soon as such weapons can be made ready to be placed in their hands. A moderate increase in the numerical strength of the force to handle the new guns will be indispensable. All the details showing the necessity for such an increase were given in the last annual report from the Division of the Atlantic, and need not be repeated here. I respectfully renew the recommendation then made that two regiments be added to the artillery, but without any material increase in the number of officers, and with a much needed change of organization, corresponding to that of the infantry and cavalry. This will give a large increase of effective strength in proportion to the number of non-commissioned officers. To effect this necessary increase about five thousand enlisted men should be added to the number now allowed by law."

General Schofield also recommends that a portion of the National Guard should be immediately organized for practical instruction in sea-coast defence. Referring to this subject, he writes:—

"The measures now adopted, by the present Congress, are understood to be the beginning of a well-matured and settled policy to make adequate provision for the sea-coast defence. It only remains for those charged with this important work to justify the confidence reposed in them, and thus justify the additional appropriations which may be required from year to year to carry the work forward to ultimate completion. During the past twenty years the necessities of the service in the Indian country have caused the posts along the sea board and northern lakes to be correspondingly neglected. At many places the barracks and quarters, as well as the fortifications, have been left to fall into a state of decay. The time and circumstances now seem peculiarly favourable for placing the sea-coast and frontiers of the country in a state of security becoming the dignity of a great and proud, though just and peaceful, nation."

There is one admirable point to be noticed in the selection and promotion of the officers of the United States' army. To obtain either a commission or advancement, it is not necessary to have any influence whatever, and there can be no doubt that, of all the most celebrated military schools of the world, those of the United States are among the best, and are well adapted to the character of her people and institutions. The military academy at West Point is rather a Congressional school than military; it has always been preliminary—that is, calculated to prepare young men for the work of life, whether it be military or civil, such as mathematics, language, chemistry, natural philosophy, &c.—so that a cadet may graduate at West Point, and yet not be familiar with the knowledge indispensable to feed, clothe, manage, and fight a company or a regiment, which are the ultimate objects of all army education. He only comes into the army proper after his graduation, and after receiving his com-

mission; yet, whilst undergoing instruction at West Point, the Corps of Cadets is subject to military law and discipline, and thus becomes an integral part of the army of the United States. Perhaps this is a little overdone; for the cadets are treated too much as schoolboys, being in receipt of pay, and not allowed to touch it lest they should be led into evil ways, and so carefully watched that it is impossible for them to obtain any recreation. There is certainly an advantage in treating them as private soldiers on parade and at their various military duties, but it seems ludicrous also that these future officers of the army should sweep their own floors and be responsible for the cleanliness of their rooms to the inspecting officer. Before the Instructor of Ordnance, and at both the cavalry and artillery exercises, is the same "schoolboy" system adopted; and, as a result, perhaps the education of the cadet is more thorough, if less pleasant, than in the various European schools.

After the cadet has obtained his commission, he is sent to the practical schools at Forts Munroe and Leavenworth, which are designed and calculated to give more perfect instruction in the most essential branches of the military service, and are deemed as necessary to an officer as a separate special training is for a surgeon, for a lawyer, or for an engineer. These schools are for commissioned officers of the army only, temporarily detailed away from their proper companies; without any increased pay or allowances, and therefore adding not a cent to the annual estimates, while they are certainly calculated to prepare the junior officers for the highest sphere of military life.

It is not very difficult to become a commissioned officer in the United States' army. So long as a man is not physically incapacitated, can remain sober, shows himself willing to go through the necessary grades of instruction, and is possessed of average intelligence, he can obtain his commission; even the private soldier is not debarred from raising himself to this position, the only stipulation being that, once enlisted, he must serve as a non-commissioned officer for two years before he is eligible for examination. Once having obtained his commission, promotion comes in the regular course of things, this uniformity in promotion being one of the most admirable traits in the military system as it is one of the most essential conditions of the efficiency of any army. It has, however, been suggested, not without good reason, that some test of qualification for promotion of line officers should be applied before an officer obtains his seniority, as, it is thought, there are a few men who neglect their opportunities for improvement when young in the service, and waste their physical strength in debauchery; but it is doubtful whether, if such test be entrusted to the senior officers of the same corps to which the aspirant belonged, this would not cause

more dissatisfaction than the present system, and lead to favouritism, or promotion through "influence."

The rank and file of the American army are composed of all nations who can speak the English language sufficiently well to be understood and to understand the word of command, and include almost as many Germans and Englishmen as Americans. The English and Irish emigrants, unable to obtain remunerative labour at home, or conscience-stricken on account of some dread deed committed by them, to the disgrace of their friends and relatives, who will no longer give them their countenance and support, go across "the Herring Pond" with the intention of starting afresh on new soil, and find their way eventually into the ranks; the German, in order to avoid the martial imposition in his own country, escapes to America, "from the frying pan into the fire," so to speak; Frenchmen and Spaniards, sailing across on voyages of adventure, dissipate their means, and have no alternative but to remain and join the forces; thus there are many who enlist to escape punishment in other countries, and who divulge to none their past history; and some do so on account of reverses of fortune, having got disgusted with civil life, or are actuated with more sinister motives still, intending to desert as soon as they obtain something better to do. Owing thus to the kindly disposition on the part of the American Government, as representative of the people, to help everybody to live, and to its wise determination to make everybody who seeks its protection work in some way for his maintenance, the foreigner finds himself received cordially into the forces. It is, at any rate, certain that remarkable men do sometimes find their way into the ranks—men of fine sensibility, possessing a rare store of information, and qualified to fill and discharge the duties of many of the highest offices within the gift of the Government with honour and credit to themselves. Indeed, there are many soldiers in the American army at the present day who have fought in England's late wars, and not a few of good birth and education. From this it will readily be inferred that a high percentage take assumed names, and come and go without either receiving correspondence or their superior officers being the wiser.

When application for enlistment is first made by the would-be recruit, a minute description is demanded of him in writing—his full name, the town and country in which he was born, his age, height, breadth round the chest, colour of his eyes and hair, his occupation, how long he has been out of employment, his reasons for wishing to enlist, whether he has ever had any nervous or venereal disorder, the name, age, and occupation of his father (if living), the name and address of his nearest friend, whether married or single, &c. To many of these questions—much the same in all armies—the recruit replies in equivocating terms, if he does not tell out-and-out falsehoods; but of course there is no one to ascertain whether or

not he is speaking the truth, and as it would certainly involve too much time and labour to investigate each case, it is a fact that the descriptive lists of private soldiers contain a number of false statements. Hence, it is no uncommon thing to see a woman early in the morning crying out frantically at headquarters, "I want my husband." To get married while in the service, or, being married, to enlist as a single man, is considered a very grave offence, and renders a soldier liable to obtain a dishonourable discharge.

On the whole it is a very easy matter to become an American soldier, so long as the eye-sight and hearing are good. The medical examination in many districts is not strict or searching. The age, so long as the would-be soldier does not look too much as if he had escaped from the nursery, is of little moment; and many veterans, twenty and five-and-twenty years in the service, will enlist again at fifty, so hardened do they become and so utterly incapacitated for any other occupation. The next step after examination is the declaration of allegiance to the United States, and one month's easy drill qualifies a man to undertake the entire duties of a soldier.

The training of the American army differs considerably from that of the British, the manual of arms adopted resembling that used by the French, while the company and battalion drill is selected from the tactics of all nations. There is considerably more target practice insisted on annually than in the British army, though the company, file, and volley firing, owing to a reduction in the allowance of ammunition, has been suspended during the past year. As a whole, the American soldiers are beyond doubt the finest marksmen in the world. Except the raw recruits, nearly every soldier in the service is a marksman—that is, he has scored 80 per cent. at 200, 300, 500, and 600 yards—there being also about 25 per cent. who become "sharpshooters" before they leave the service, scoring 90 points at 200, 300, and 500, 85 at 600 and 800, and 80 at 1000 yards. This is, perhaps, due to the fact that each soldier is allowed 400 rounds of ammunition during the target season every year—sometimes more—which he is compelled to go on expending until he has obtained his marksman's badge. Of late a sharp look-out has had to be kept by the officers in command of the various companies, owing to the target record being so uniformly good that it was thought false marking had been resorted to in many cases by men over-zealous of the position of their respective companies in the service, or eager to show a large number of marksmen and sharpshooters in the shortest possible time and with the least expenditure of ammunition. The rifle adopted weighs seven pounds, being the well-known "Springfield," that being considered a more serviceable gun than the Martini-Henry, nearly as easy to load quickly, simpler in construction, stronger, and quite as accurate as the latter.

It has been said that "the American soldier is the best fed, best

paid, and hardest worked of any soldier in the world." In the first two respects this is undoubtedly true. The food served up at company mess is always wholesome, substantial, and sufficient; and any soldier requiring more than this is well able to pay for his little delicacies sold to him at the commissary or subsistence stores considerably cheaper than in the shops of the neighbouring towns, and nearly at cost price. Two cooks and a non-commissioned officer are put in charge of the kitchen, and, to the credit of the army, the officers are compelled to take interest in the comfort and health of the men, seeing that their rations are wholesome and properly served up, and the kitchen and mess-room kept clean and in good order. Nearly every company is able to save money out of the bread and coffee allowance, and with this they procure potatoes and other vegetables, meat being served up twice and sometimes three meals a-day, of which there is an ample supply for every soldier. Hash or stew in the morning for breakfast, beef or pork and beans for dinner, with vegetables and sometimes soup (meat-pie being occasionally served up for a change) and stew, or pancakes, or plum-pudding for supper, form the usual diet, there being an abundance of bread and coffee on the table each meal. On special days, such as July 4, Thanksgiving Day, Christmas, the men usually club together, subscribing from a quarter to a half-dollar, for a really first-class dinner. And again, they are often enabled to save considerable money towards "extras" by providing venison, ducks, wild fowl, and fish, which they bring to the quarters after having obtained leave for the purpose of hunting and fishing, the commanding officer rarely refusing his men "leave of absence" for such purposes as these, sometimes for twenty days at a stretch, when such as are on pass procure a team from the quartermaster, and take with them, besides their guns and ammunition, a sufficient quantity of field rations, tents, mattresses, blankets, cooking utensils, and such other things as they are likely to require. This certainly makes army life more romantic and enjoyable, and inures the men to hardship and labour.

In addition to his food and clothing (for the latter he is allowed about two hundred dollars in five years, out of which all he can save is paid to him on his discharge), he has an *occupation* besides mere "soldiering," for which as a private he receives thirteen dollars a month during his first two years, fourteen dollars during his third year, fifteen dollars his fourth, and sixteen his fifth. Every re-enlistment, it should be added, procures for him two dollars more per month, and after thirty years' service he receives a pension sufficient to keep him comfortably for the rest of his life, besides the chance of his obtaining an easy post under the Government, or connected in some way with the service. But besides his soldier's pay, which often forms but a small part of his actual income, there are various ways by which an American soldier can make money. If he be

clerk, he has a chance of being employed in the commissary stores, quartermaster's department, &c., which just about doubles his pay; if he be a tailor, or a shoemaker, or a barber, or with a wife able to do the washing of the company, he can make a very good income indeed, that, of course, being dependent on his industry. In addition to these are teamsters on "extra duty," and oftentimes carpenters, bricklayers, general jobbers, bakers, a schoolmaster, and a librarian—each man to his trade or inclination. Sometimes one finds at a post only one barber, or one tailor, to five or six companies; and when it is considered that each soldier pays one dollar per month for shaving and hair-cutting, and that the majority of men prefer to buy their cloth by the yard at the quartermaster's stores, in order to have more money due to them on their discharge under the item of "saving from clothing allowance," employing the army tailor to make up their uniform, it will readily be seen that the company barber and tailor run a lucrative business with their comrades. The same remark applies to the shoemaker, who, if he be industrious and a good workman at his craft, can make with ease from sixty to a hundred dollars per month. This seems incredible, but it is nevertheless a fact.

The subject of education in the army has always been one of deep solicitude to all interested in the furtherance of the best interests of the service, whether viewing its immediate benefits to the ranks or its future advantageous results when the men are restored to the full exercise of the privileges of citizens. Those men who have had permission to marry, or who have been allowed to enlist as married men, have the privilege of sending their children to the post school, where all books and necessities are supplied free of expense. The officers' children are likewise sent there, though, instead of setting an example, they contribute often to the demoralization of (in other respects) so useful an institution; for the knowledge that their teacher is only an enlisted man, inferior in rank and subject to orders from their parents (which places him in a very awkward position when they, the officers' children, need punishment or correction), coupled with the strong temptation thus thrown in their way to abuse and "crow over" the remaining portion of the school, detracts from, rather than enhances, its value. There is also a night school for such of the enlisted men who are sufficiently wise and careful of their best interests to take advantage of; but this is in most cases only moderately attended, it being found altogether impracticable to compel the men to be present the same as at roll-call, guard-mount, &c. A good library, stocked with the works of the best authors in science, history, travel, poetry, and fiction, and in which the interesting magazines, periodicals, and newspapers of the day are provided, is also to be found at every post for the use of officers and men. It is difficult to overrate the value of this privilege

offered to the soldier, for it often happens that the post library is not only the best, but often the sole institution for reading purposes for miles around, and hence one which the citizens would only be too glad to share with them. Each officer or enlisted man has the right of taking two separate books to his quarters for a period not exceeding fourteen days (for which, of course, he is held responsible by placing the number and title of each book, his signature, the date when taken out and when returned in a record kept for such purpose), there being five or six separate editions kept of the most popular English and American authors.

When one takes into account the liberal clothing allowance to which each soldier is entitled, and also the fact that he obtains all his wearing apparel at wholesale prices—that is, at very little more than the prime cost—one is apt to feel disappointment at his general appearance. For splendour of effect, neatness, and everything which makes a soldier look smart and warlike, the uniform of the American compares unfavourably with that of the British soldier. The clothing of the former is certainly useful, and quite as durable as that of any soldier belonging to other countries; but when one remembers the many and varied uniforms of the British infantry, the gallant and picturesque costumes of the Guards and Lancers, a smile is apt to lurk on the countenance at sight of the twenty-five regiments of infantry all dressed alike, and the ungainly cavalry (never bearing any pretensions to be called “gay,” except at inspections) and artillery, serving under the government of dominions so vast and far-reaching as the United States.

Mention should be made of the two black regiments of infantry, the remnant or offshoot of the First and Second South Carolina Volunteers—the first slave regiments mustered into the service of the United States during the late civil war, and which in 1862 contained scarcely a freeman, had not one mulatto in ten, and a far smaller proportion who could read or write when enlisted. At that time, fighting with ropes round their necks for liberty, and denied the ordinary courtesies of war, they themselves compelled the Government to grant them their freedom by an exhibition of conduct as humane as it was brave, temperate, manly, earnest. The same characteristics distinguish their conduct now, though neither their physical nor moral temperament give them that toughness, that obstinate purpose of living, which sustains the more materialistic Anglo-Saxon.

Altogether there are many good points in the organization of the American army, which are well worthy the attention of, and even imitation by, those whose duty it is to care for the comfort, enhance the usefulness, and regulate the movements, privileges, and (not the least important) dietary of forces more liable to be called into requisition. Setting aside the enormous outlay annually—for it has

been computed that every soldier in the American army costs the Government during five years' term of service at least 1200 dollars—and, if possible, disregarding the fact of the unreadiness for war which is everywhere apparent in the dilapidated condition of the defences, we may assert, without fear of contradiction, that the military policy of the Government of the United States contains both wise and useful elements in it; but the above matters are so important that, to except them—i.e., the cost, and the great purpose for which every army is constructed—viz., to defend the people at any moment from whatsoever declared enemy it is called upon to face—is to say that the nut would be sound if only the kernel were not rotten—or, perhaps, to employ this homely simile better, since we refer more particularly to the want of protection arising from the dilapidated condition of the national defences, we might say, the kernel would continue sound if only the shell were not thin and crumbling away. This, of course, is the fault of the Government and the people whom it represents; and surely a Government which can afford to be so liberal as it is, should, at any rate, see that its premises are secure from enemies on the outside when they keep such a poor watch within, and have so much at stake.

Viewing the army from within the ranks, and not from the standpoint of an enemy already at close quarters with it, we must admit that it is perhaps, on the whole, as ably managed and as capable of coping with an equal body of men as would be a like number of men taken at haphazard from any European army. If there be no immediate prospect of hostilities, the military is made to go through the regular routine as if there were; and there is no less laxity in the appearance of the officers in performing their duties than in the men, who are, as before stated, allowed to cultivate business as well as martial habits. There seems to be a deep seriousness connected with this branch of the Government, whether it is called for or not; and no doubt many an officer can be found who never fought a battle, and never expects to fight one, who would lay claim to be as useful (not ornamental altogether) citizens of their country as any other commissioned officer belonging to the respective armies of European nations anticipating an immediate call to arms.

Naturally of late years, when the American army has been recruited, like Falstaff's regiment, from "the dregs of a calm world and a long peace," there has been likewise very little to prevent a man, driven to his wits' ends, from joining the forces. He will sometimes take to the army as a means of tiding over a passing difficulty in his way, or until, like Micawber, something "turns up" to suit him better, and he has outlived the trouble and attendant disgrace that have alienated him from his friends—ay, he has not unfrequently been known to enlist in some company about to travel to a post

conveniently near a town he is desirous of reaching for no other purpose than to save his travelling expenses; and, perhaps, in any case, he has even less compunction about making up his mind to desert—or, in the expressive language of the soldier, “to take a walk”—than he had in the first instance to enlist. There is no army where desertions are so frequent or so little regarded by the authorities. This fact is due to many causes. In the first place, a soldier in the New Country does not usually enlist from inclination, hence military life is less likely to agree with him than if he did; secondly, he has more opportunities of finding employment on march from town to town, or among the snug ranches far away from the sound of the bugle, his services having been secured by some master on the look out for men to tend his cattle, taking the secret of his desertion as a guarantee of his good behaviour; thirdly, he has far better chances of getting away and much larger territory to seek shelter in, besides being within easy reach of countries—to wit, Canada and Mexico—where protection is afforded him; fourthly, it is not easy to detect a deserter even in military uniform, if he only use ordinary caution; fifthly (and probably for all these before-mentioned reasons combined), the authorities do not trouble much about him when he is gone, probably regarding pursuit as “a wild goose chase.” Few deserters, indeed, are given up to the authorities by civilians eager to obtain the thirty dollars offered to any person “who shall arrest or cause to be arrested,” &c.; a greater number of deserters by far surrender themselves from sheer inability to obtain employment through lack of character, and are thus driven to undergo sentences varying from two to five years’ imprisonment imposed by court-martial.

In 1887 the report showed there were no less than 2240 desertions, while last year this total was actually exceeded by 196, or just about 10 per cent. of the enlisted strength of the army. As a means of lowering this percentage, which is certainly very discreditable, various remedies have been proposed from year to year; for instance, to make prison life more severe than it is at present, to lengthen the term of punishment allotted to deserters, to add as far as possible to the comfort of the soldier by giving him better rations and an increase of pay, &c., at the same time the officer in command being ordered to take the deepest possible interest in the dietary and comforts of the soldier. General Schofield, however, finding these suggestions have not answered, proposes something new. He says:

“After a careful consideration of the views expressed by the many who have discussed the subject, I recommend the following, viz. :—

“1st. That the reward, to be paid for the apprehension of a deserter and his delivery at the nearest military post, be increased to 100 dollars; to be reimbursed out of his retained pay.

"2nd. That all United States marshals and their deputies, and all sheriffs, constables, and police officers of the several States, Territories, and Cities be authorized by law to arrest and deliver deserters.

"3rd. That a large part, at least one-half, of the pay of soldiers, enlisted hereafter, be retained until they shall have fulfilled their contract of service, either by serving out their term of enlistment, or by death in service, or honourable discharge. To this the Secretary of War should be authorized to make exception, in the cases of men who are known to devote their pay to the support of dependent relatives.

"4th. That it be made practicable, in time of peace, for an enlisted man to dissolve his contract of enlistment in a manner honourable to himself and just to the Government, by obtaining a discharge with forfeiture of so much of his retained pay as may be necessary to reimburse the United States for the expense incurred in the enlistment, clothing, transportation, &c., of a recruit to supply his place. In short, make it practicable for a soldier to terminate a contract, with which he has become dissatisfied, in a fair and honourable way; and make his punishment as sure as possible if he attempts to terminate it in a dishonourable way.

"I limit myself to the above recommendations, as being manifestly appropriate and unobjectionable. I believe their adoption would greatly reduce the number of desertions and increase the contentment and efficiency of the troops. The large element of professional deserters must continue to curse the army until some unobjectionable means can be devised by which deserters can be identified when they attempt to re-enlist. This subject will be given careful consideration."

It is very doubtful if an increase in the reward offered for the apprehension of a deserter would bring about much difference in the number of desertions; and clause No. 3 if persisted in is more calculated to break up the army altogether, for the dissatisfaction among the men at the proposition having been made at all has been so outspoken since the report was published that without doubt such a change would most assuredly aggravate the disorder. The last remedy is perhaps on the whole a desirable one, as it is certain to effect a rational change in the condition of the army; for while there are many hundreds of men ready to serve for three years, and will submit, even should they dislike the service, for that period, they cannot be got to enlist for five; it is a notorious fact that three-fourths of the desertions occur in the third year of the soldier's enlistment. At any rate, it is not possible that this deplorable result is owing to any laxity on the part of the officers. No; the majority of deserters are men who have wholly or partly made up their minds to desert when they enlist; while, on the other hand, there are many of that very class who become so fascinated with the service, knowing that their income and livelihood are always sure, instead of using the army as a means of temporary shelter, pass the best portion of their lives in its ranks. How many parents are there in this country and elsewhere who have long since mourned for their sons as dead, who have not been heard of for a long period in the haunts of their birth, and perhaps never will be seen or heard of there again, who are now marching under the American flag? A similar

question, doubtless, might be mournfully put with respect to the composition of many an army; but were there any means of obtaining an answer, the novelist would find more subjects for his pen in the romantic lives of the American soldiery, flat and uninteresting as they may appear to the individuals composing it, than in the whole of the Western Continent besides.

With respect to his daily habits, the American soldier is much like any other soldier. He is, for the most part, an easy, good-natured, devil-may-care fellow, regarding the terrors of the guard-house with less awe than the European soldier—less, certainly, than he ought to be made to do; hence the number of court-martials and prisoners is on an average enormously larger than in any other army in the world. No one can spend money with a more princely air than he; he is, as a general thing, an embryo millionaire as long as his wealth lasts—that is, for a period of about forty-eight hours after he receives his pay. He gets but small pay in one sense, feels independent, and spends it right royally in the saloons and dance-halls, knowing that Uncle Sam will see to his worldly comforts; and when his money is gone, he retires to his bunk, glances retrospectively over the sudden departure of his wealth (considering how he has been imposed upon), and philosophically reckons on another pay day coming, when he resolves to be more provident, but when, alas! he is just as extravagant as ever. The man who becomes a soldier in the United States' service is not without his own sense of honour. He often possesses fine sensibilities and talents of no mean degree, which may lie dormant for a time, but which may also, with good treatment and proper nourishment, accomplish much for his own service. Yet for all this, when we look at the British soldier, and remember the manly courage, the stubborn determination, the noble spirit of patriotism, which seems to inspire all his movements, whether in the field of battle or in a state of readiness in times of peace, we know and feel he means business; but regarding the American soldier, one is inclined to exclaim, "You might be able to fight, but you don't look as if you were intended to do so. The American flag has none other to be jealous of, consequently you neither feel nor understand the pride and glory of a British soldier. Your geographical position has made you secure; but though you enjoy the benefits of peace, you cannot appreciate that intense love of his country which makes a man even desire to lay down his life for the sake of the land of his birth."

Doubtless during the war of the Secession the military ardour of the contending forces was great indeed, because the animosity existing between the rival factions was bitter in the extreme, and each man on either side made it a personal matter. Things, however, since then have changed vastly; for the army, until quite recently, seemed to have become to the Government an institution of secondary im-

portance, and to the people an opening for a body of men who otherwise would degenerate into loafers, while the men themselves regard it as an easy and sure means of obtaining subsistence, willingly submitting to discipline which they thus impose upon themselves because in civil life they have, through their own fault perhaps, been unable to succeed.

The American citizen, however, who fears an immediate outbreak, or hopes to see the army regain its prestige, will read the commanding general's report with satisfaction; and he may reasonably expect, if the entire suggestions made therein are not carried out, at any rate a livelier interest evinced, and more useful reforms established in this department of the Government, as one of the chief characteristics distinguishing the new Ministry from the defeated Administration so unmistakably ordered to the right about.

CECIL LOGSDAIL.

HOME AFFAIRS.

The Article usually appearing under the above heading is unavoidably omitted in this month's issue. But that which should be its subject matter will form a part of the Article which will appear in November.

IRELAND AND THE EMPIRE.

BEFORE many years have passed over us, it will probably become clear to those who watch the perspective of events, that the most practical and important result of the Irish Home Rule agitation has been to force on the consideration of the Imperial Federation question. But for party passions Irish Home Rule might have grown naturally as the first fruits of the Irish situation; it will come now, forced on by obvious Imperial necessities; or by the necessities of the present political situation. Clearly a new national party is wanted; but any real national party must be also an Imperial party; and what the Unionists do not understand is that every patriotic party must now be a party of the nations—*i.e.*, of the real factors that constitute the English State.

In the position England has now reached we must be prepared to federate the Home nations in order to be ready for confederation with the other parts of the Empire, which has so grown that the federal principle, the top and crown of political achievement, can alone serve and dominate the situation.

Thus the situation is ready and there are statesmen ready; but with few exceptions the statesmen are not in England. Men are ready to come up from the east and the west, from the north and the south, to sit down at the Imperial banquet in London; but where are the statesmen to receive them? The mischief is that the provincial intellects, who administer Imperial interests at the centre, have the ignoble opportunity of rejecting Imperial measures suggested to them by their betters all round, measures which lack simply the urgency of official sanction or representative power. And so once more we see how like "high office is to the pyramids—only two sorts of animals reach the top, reptiles and eagles."

Since 1837, the date of her Majesty's accession, the Empire has grown from 1,100,000 square miles to 8,400,000; our Colonial European population has grown from 2,000,000 to 10,000,000; our State revenue at home from £24,000,000 to £122,000,000; and in general terms the British Empire has increased more than five-fold in the fifty years. As far back as 1875, Mr. W. E. Forster declared at Edinburgh that federation would make the Colonies partners instead of dependencies; and, later on, that without some such scheme their self-government would grow into independence. The

essence of federation, however, is that it affirms the principles of locality and independence equally with those of generality and empire. The federal principle affirms local authority for local needs, and Imperial authority for Imperial needs. Each balances the other, and the only question is what are the essential factors and conditions that dictate the modifications of the actual rule of State to be adopted. To be, therefore, of a national party which is not also *the party of the nations*, is to be simply "a little Englander," willing to destroy one nation for the sake of another (which is Professor Dicey's notion of providential arrangement), and willing also to forego Imperial consolidation in order to do it! 'If you cannot organize by nations you cannot organize at all. If you want to unite, you cannot leave the strongest, largest, and completest factor of unity out of count. You must follow nature and take the world as it is.

The chief constituents of our greater Britain demand equal citizenship with John Bull at home; and that demand must be conceded unless the lesser Britain wants to be left severely alone. Again, if our Cabinet is to be a Cabinet of Empire, the imperial men of the Empire must be in it; and if our Second Chamber is to last, heredity must give way to the representation and delegation of real powers. These things must come, for they are the real forces of any real future, and woe unto those through whom they cannot come now. The only question is, can we make these changes without waiting for the pressure of necessity and the challenge of a foe? Can we not set our house in order except on the morrow of a disaster, or on the eve of a defeat? John Bull has, in fact, to be born again as the Imperial Englishman. All our Colonies and Independencies know well enough how hard that is, and what that means; it is about time that John Bull began to know it too.

The Federation League, inaugurated on the 29th of July, 1884, by Mr. Forster, urged, that, to secure Imperial unity, "some form" of federation is essential, and passed a definite resolution having reference to a plan for the "organized defence of common rights," and although in 1886 they did not get much out of Lord Salisbury, in 1887 a very important Colonial Conference discussed the whole question, and agreed upon a scheme of Colonial and Imperial defence, with a British Zollverein to find the funds, the scheme itself of federation being purposely left out. The great fact about the movement is the long array of strong names of men of light and leading—though not, as we say, of the first official rank—who are committed to it. There the matter now rests, except that Lord Salisbury has been approached with a view to a second conference.

Now the Irish question is so great; and involves such far-reaching issues, that it will enlarge the bounds of Liberalism, and the possibilities of statesmanship in getting solved.

In her treatment of Irish nationality will England find either the achievement of her greatest power, or her uttermost overthrow and defeat? At the first she was a nation among the home nations; later she became an Empire among Empires, now she is a confederal centre. But the greater England grows, the greater grows her danger. With Ireland as a constant enemy, England, whether as nation or empire, can never be strong, nor could any confederal council or opinion ever support her in thwarting the welfare of a sister State and nation. Injustice links us with littleness, and we must give over torturing Ireland or else give up our future. Irish autonomy must come, as also British federation; and following on, Imperial federation will push its advance far beyond the borders of Tory or Unionist chaos and old night, the greatest step but one that yet remains to be taken in the political settlement of our planet.

To show the "what" and the "why" of Ireland's rights and England's duties, to show why England must do the one, and why Ireland must obtain the other, is to present the whole scheme of the Irish and English renaissance. We must show what England and Ireland can do for each other and for the English world if they can work together, and the tremendous alternative for England if they cannot. On the one hand the crown of glory that will reward her, on the other the discrowning and fall by which Ireland's rights and wrongs would be surely, perhaps finally, vindicated and avenged.

For absolutely no reason we are allowing Irish landlords, the peers and the Tories, kept in office by professed Liberals, to prepare the occasion of a vast catastrophe. We have let them lay the train; shall we let them light the match? Irish policy at American polling booths, aided by some sudden frenzy, such as sweeps over nations, the cry of America for the Americans, or Canada for the Canadians—either of these in sympathy with the other, re-echoing that other cry of Ireland for the Irish, would lose us at least an Empire.

The Irish question even primarily concerns not only the Irish nation, but all the four home nations. It involves the federation of the home group as a step towards Imperial confederation. It is part of a system of delegation, devolution, and decentralization, removing from the centre what is provincial, and bringing to the centre what is essential. It involves the principle of a Grand Council of Empire for the reception of which the present happy-go-lucky lords' house has to be swept and garnished. It involves the alternative of England's being the general home and centre for untold ages; or of her dwindling to but an island in a northern sea. It involves the political extinction of those amongst us who have too great an interest in our littleness and dismemberment. It involves settling the centre of Imperial gravity of all our populations in London, on the principle of equal citizenship and representation, or the shifting

of that centre to Melbourne or Ottawa, or anywhere else as these populations may drift and change their locality. It involves the enlargement of the British constitution to the proportions of British power, or the contraction of that power within the limits of outworn forms and little minds. It has already discredited some who wanted to lead without being able to see, and it will for ever set aside all that policy of despair which seeks the living among the dead, and would build up one nation on the ruins of another. It adopts manhood as the only power in politics, and free associated nations as the only living stones in that mighty temple of citizenship and civilization which some great master builder will soon be called upon to put together for us.

It is absurd to suppose either that Great Britain can continue to decide for the third of the habitable globe, which her colonies and independencies constitute, what and when shall be their wars and alliances; or that without such right of decision the colonies are to be put in a state of defence and defended by the mother country. Representation must precede and vote taxation; and a central council in London on a broadly representative and Imperial basis, with members and a Cabinet drawn from the whole empire, is the only way to secure it. When Imperial interests prevail, little European questions, and littler Whig and Tory questions will be dwarfed to their right position.

There can be no difficulty in distinguishing either local and national Irish matters, or local and national English ones, from general and Imperial ones. The cleavage is clear, natural, obvious. It was defined in principle by Burke. It was marked out in detail a hundred years ago in America, and has worked through or over all obstacles. It was embodied in the Canadian constitution, and has worked well even towards the making of a nation there for nineteen years. The reason is that generality and locality are great natural principles, based on individual rights and local and Imperial necessities, and tend always towards the largest and final unity absolutely necessary in the conduct of human affairs. These principles worked themselves out in the United States in four years, at a cost of a million lives and two thousand millions sterling. In Canada, more and more British every year, we see the same process, and in Ireland we have seen it for centuries striving and thriving against all the might of England. This nation-making is not the difficulty. It takes care of itself. The difficulty is that in issuing from the national to the Imperial status, the puzzle-heads amongst us see, not a conference but a conflict of nations, maintaining, even from professorial chairs, that one of them has to be sacrificed to the other. The fact for England to face is that she must abandon autocracy or abdicate power. She cannot have the strength of an empire without a policy of empire, which is a "policy of the nations," and her

future, if she have one, will be that of a central power among confederal equals. As things go now, we in England shall be out in the cold in some years hence. The colonies are becoming nations with their own natural centres—so to speak, sovereignties with outside relations, policies and interests, and we are doing nothing to meet, and everything to mar, their aspirations after the larger unity which they now would shape and share. Power is fast shifting from our English centre to others more remote; and if our policy does not change, this power will desert us. We must choose between the weakness of division, or the strength of union, and if we want union we must accept its conditions. What the colonies ask for and will soon be able to take, is the citizenship of British subjects or the independence to set up for themselves. If they stay with us they will require full representative equality with Englishmen, and necessarily some central Imperial chamber in London. The British Parliament is getting old and wants a transfusion of the blood of the new races. A large minority of both our Houses are guiltless of courage or ideas, and should be sent home for the masquerading valets and vestrymen they are. They do not represent either Great Britain, or Ireland, or the colonies. They satisfy mentally the mathematical definition of a point. They stand not on manhood, but on property and tradition; and their caste has long been bred, not least by the influence of Pitt, to mistake Cæsarism for citizenship, and idleness and insolence for power.

The main classification of Britain's statesmen depends upon their appreciation of her main interests. All our public men, whatever else they do or leave undone, are really helping or hindering this movement, which aims first at the recognition and reconciliation of the Irish nationality, next at British federation, and lastly at Imperial consolidation. By their conduct in this respect must they be judged and ranked. All are really either "Insularists" who think that England can get along by herself, or "Imperialists" who would at once unite her with those of her race, and with those within her borders who are willing.

This is the grand distinction between partisans with vested interests in the littleness and dismemberment of our empire and those whose loyalty may secure its future. The man who denies Ireland a national parliament, and whose only plan—besides that of "force which is no remedy"—for uniting Ireland to England is to seat at Westminster the full number of Irish M.P.'s, whom Westminster does not want, and most of whom Ireland would rather keep at home—he, we say, is no real "Unionist," for he disunites. He is simply an "Insularist" in intellect and action, and has no part or place amongst statesmen.

If Ireland were really united to us, and she had good men enough and to spare both for Westminster and Dublin, it would not matter,

as regards local and national concerns, whether she had a hundred members at Westminster or only thirty-two, one for each Irish county. The essence is consolidation and life. Without that, a man who wants the hundred may be a real Separatist, and he who would be content with thirty-two a real Unionist, besides being a rational federalist, caring for Ireland and caring also for the empire. In like manner statesmen, who wish to unite Great Britain and Ireland by the bonds of justice, constitutional law, and nationality, and who see that Ireland may now become the first fruits of federation, are no "Separatists" whatever those who wish separation may call them. He who would destroy the Irish nation in order to build up the British Empire is a fool all round, for in sacrificing the means he sacrifices the end; whilst he who, without any thought of empire, builds up the Irish nation for the pride, the interests, and the glory of the Irish people, is more than half a unionist, in creating that which, once created and let tolerably well alone by tyrants, would be sure to gravitate towards empire. We propose here to introduce the opinions of the five picked prizemen not long since selected for the London Chamber of Commerce, out of 106 competitors, from all parts of the Empire—opinions expressed on the practical requirements of our English colonies and empires; and to place side by side with them those of the profoundest German thinkers on the abstract question of "nationality," so lately with the Germans the supreme question of all. The consensus of opinion shown by these citizens of the world of action and that of philosophy is as important as it is remarkable. The first prizeman, Mr. Greswell, late Professor of Classics at the Cape University, considers "imperial federation a way of imperial salvation," ridiculing "those practical politicians to whom a British Empire extending its organization over the world is inconceivable and impracticable," and adding, that, "if the English Demos disregard the legacy of a colonial empire, they will prove yet again that democracies cannot be trusted with empire."

Mr. Fitzgerald, of New Zealand, another prizeman, asks: "Does any future destiny present itself as possible for the British Empire, but, on the one hand, a federation upon fair and equitable grounds, or, on the other, its final disruption?" "In case of war," pertinently asks Mr. Bradshaw, of Melbourne, "who would be carrying it on? The British and Colonial Ministries. Why not then carry out one comprehensive scheme?" "We believe," says Mr. Turnock, of Winnipeg, Manitoba, "that the next quarter of a century will decide whether the summit of England's greatness has been reached, and the period of her decadence is at hand. It will be well for England if she profits by the mistakes, lest she meet the fate of her great prototype. A national spirit is each year on the increase, but Canadians have not a voice in the making of their treaties, neither can they prevent a war by which their country might be desolated."

Canada must be an active instead of a passive part of a great nation. Is England prepared to confer on Canada the full rights and privileges of British citizens? We propose to make the old countryman and the colonist equal, and to give the colonist the same voice as the old countryman in Imperial affairs. We believe that with a scheme that accomplishes this they will be perfectly satisfied. This is to be accomplished by federation."

So far it is our colonists who in thought and action are rather disposed to get ahead of us, and who, if we cannot go with them, will bear the burden and glories of the old grandmother of parliaments away from us. But even among us party lines are shifting; they await "a party of the nations." Politics are getting profounder, broader, intenser; the old watchwords are ridiculous, and we must use once more the line and the plummet, and settle not what is Whig or Tory, but what is right or wrong.

Is it Whig or Tory to know that Ireland is a nation, and to do nothing for her nationality? Is it Whig or Tory to see that the triune home empire of these islands has got to be made safe, and how? Is it Whig or Tory to have and to hold the aggregate empire of all the Britains?

"As bees when sucking honey cease to hum,
So Whigs when tasting office sweets are dumb."

Democracy is no author of confusion, and with nations for its factor a stronger centralization is alike safe, possible, and unavoidable. We have done for ever with a sectional manhood, a sectarian manhood, and a priest-ridden manhood. We will have a national, nay, an Imperial manhood.

"Not poppy nor mandragora,
Nor all the drowsy syrups of the world,
Can ever medicine us to that sweet sleep
Which we owed yesterday."

The British constitution is in its infancy. A little island in a northern sea is not an empire that encircles and overshadows the world. We have shunted the old Whig and Tory family coach for the lightning express of Democracy, yet the new constitution is but the means for the perfecting of the great coming race of the world.

The age of equality is the age of construction. It is the golden cycle of opinion, organization, freedom, and power. Federation is the top and crown of political science and achievement; and we can at last appeal to the immense designs and inexhaustible energies of the people. The whole English world gravitates towards that democracy whose organization is of necessity the problem of every advancing age and people.

What then say the great German thinkers on those nationalities which are the mean term between the individual and Humanity?"

Hegel, in his *Philosophy of History*, says this :

"In the history of the world, the individuals we have to do with are the Peoples: Totalities that are States. The State is a living universal Spirit, but which at the same time is the self-conscious spirit of the individuals comprising the community. The State, its laws and arrangements, constitute the rights of its members; its natural features, mountains, air, and waters, are their country and fatherland, their outward material property; the history of this State their deeds; what their ancestors have produced belongs to them and lives in their memory. All is their possession, just as they are possessed by it, for it constitutes their existence, their being. Their imagination is occupied with the ideas thus presented, while the adoption of these laws, and of a fatherland so conditioned, is the expression of their will. It is this matured totality which constitutes one being, the spirit of one people. To it the individual members belong: each unit is the son of his nation, and at the same time, in so far as the State is developed, the son of his age. This spiritual being, or Time-spirit, is his; he is a representative of it; it is that in which he originated, and in which he lives. Among the Athenians the word Athens had a double import, suggesting that goddess who represented the spirit of the people and its unity. Athene the goddess is Athens herself—i.e., the real and concrete spirit of the citizens.

"This spirit of a people is a determinate and particular spirit, which constitutes the basis and substance of the other forms of a nation's consciousness in the same way as the (individual) soul exists as the complex of the individual's faculties.

"The remark next in order is that each particular national genius is to be treated as only one individual in the process of universal history. The forms which these grades of progress assume are the characteristic national spirits of history: the peculiar tenor of their moral life, of their government, art, religion, science. To realize these grades is the boundless impulse of the World-spirit, the goal of its irresistible urging; for this division into organic members and the full development of each, is its idea."

And Strauss, on the subject, "What is our rule of life?" follows Hegel, in words of surpassing beauty, subtlety, and force:—

"There is now growing up around us a certain doctrine which declares itself opposed to the principle of nationality. But we know, in every appeal, the sequence of procedure must be observed. Now the mean tribunal between the individual and Humanity is the nation. He who ignores his nation does not thereby become a cosmopolitan, but continues an egotist. Patriotism is the sole ascent to Humanitarianism.

"The nations with their peculiarities are the divinely ordained—namely, the natural forms through which mankind manifests itself, which no man of sense may overlook, from which no man of courage may withdraw himself. The interest in a common State cannot

replace the national interest, for it is impossible to exalt individuals above their egotism and hurry to be rich—to the height of ideal aspirations. Without patriotism, there simply can be no deep (political) feeling.

"Schiller knew and expressed it with the whole force of his sterling judgment, that the individual 'must attach himself closely to his own native land,' because there only lie the strong roots of his energy.

"Only in its natural division into nations may mankind approach the goal of its destiny; him who despises this division, who has no reference for what is national, we may fairly point to as *hic niger est*, whether he wear the cowl or the red cap."

But we may be forced to say *hic niger est* of others besides the wearers of black cowls or red caps; and if, after this cosmopolitan opinion, we want the deadly contrast of mediocrity and conventionality combined at home in an Oxford Professor of high repute, we may turn to Mr. Dicey's *Case of England* or to his *Unionist Delusions*, in which latter he rightly says, "It is time that we Liberal Unionists should clear our minds of cant," and then proceeds to clear his own mind by a wholesale outpouring of something very like that article upon the British public! In the *Case* he implies (his own favourite delusion) that the Almighty has so managed or mismanaged the world, that a nation of five millions has to be sacrificed to one of thirty-five millions; that the passion of nationality is a "malady;" that if a vicious system of land tenure is a cause of lawlessness, the Irish Parliament is needless; for the Parliament of the United Kingdom (a Parliament of lawlords and landlords who have done the mischief) "can reform the land system of Ireland, and ought to be able to carry through," &c. In the *Delusions* the Professor further details his ideas of federation, and of the hopelessly evil government of the world, in a way which is unsurpassable, and which is a distinct reproach to the University, and a scandal to English thought and literature. He says: "The central power is under a federal system limited by the acknowledgment of State rights; this means that in Ireland the central government is powerless," which may of course happen if the State rights are too strong, or the balance of power unscientific, the use and object of the federal system being to establish such a balance. Again, "Federalism strengthens the Parliament at Dublin, it therefore weakens the Parliament at Westminster." Not so. Doubtless, if "Westminster" attempts foolish and evil things *re* Ireland, not warranted by the federal contract, its power to carry them out would be weakened by a Dublin Parliament, but any proper arrangement would harmonize ~~not~~ weaken power. Once more, "Whoever attempts to establish Irish independence fights against the centralizing tendencies of the age—science, railways, telegraphs," &c. Indeed; and so a qualified independence

means absolute independence ; and the qualified independence of a federal government, the greatest centralizing political agency of modern times, is simply political disintegration ! How mistaken poor De Tocqueville was when he explains this " great invention of political science," by which not the allied States, but the Federal Government executes its own enactments and maintains the balance between States. Surely we need not point out to readers of this Review that, not the Dublin or English Parliament, but the aggregate Federal Parliament, would secure what the Professor calls " Irish independence." He clearly mistakes the qualified sovereignty of a constitutional compact for the absolute sovereignty of the old constitutional text-books. Mr. Dicey is in all his mistakes just as " cocksure " as another Oxford professor, Mr. Goldwin Smith, who in his latest remarks on Home Rule, and on the divergent force of French Canadian nationality, entirely forgets the fact that it was Pitt, the arch impostor, Pitt, the great architect of mud and ruins, and so-called " unions," who severed the two Canadas from one another in the hope of rendering them both powerless against George III. It is certain that, until Irish Home Rule is conceded, and Pitt's bad work undone, not only will other home matters be prejudiced or postponed, but Imperial interests also will be jeopardised or destroyed.

What, then, is to be done ? Why, in the first place, we must at once go beyond Mr. W. E. Forster's dictum, a true note perhaps at the time, but not a true note to go on repeating—viz., that we may do more harm by any scheme than by no scheme at all. Events multiply, and the world shrinks much too fast for such counsels. Two things at least can be done at once, and they can and ought to be done together. We want at once and together an ocean " Wehr," or Imperial navy, and an Imperial advisory representative council in London. If we cannot get Canadians and Australians, nay, even " Africanders " into the Cabinet or the Lords at once, for these are the three great self-governing groups ; if the provincial men in London will not propose, why let the imperial colonists " dispose." Let them elect and send men to London whom they can trust, send them as actual representatives, and see if there are any politicians in London who dare disregard the opinions and advice of these delegates of countries, compared with which Great Britain is but a speck, and of nations that must soon outgrow us. These embryo British Empires would then have two things—an arm and a voice. There would be a Canadian war fleet and an Australian war fleet backing the counsels of Great Britain in tones that would reverberate through the world, and with a power, which, together with the great English merchant fleets—whose directors have but to touch the wires for armed merchantmen to issue forth from every harbour—could in case of need sweep the seas of our opponents !

There are many schemes for Imperial constitutions, but constitutions that grow are better than those that are made. We have to deal with the following elements: I. Great Britain and Ireland. II. Self-governing and practically independent colonies. III. Crown colonies. IV. Dependencies. Or taking them as groups, there are: I. The British Isles with 36,000,000 souls. II. The Canadian group with 5,250,000. III. The Australian group with 3,500,000. IV. The South African group with 1,750,000. V. The West Indian group with 1,500,000. VI. The Indian Empire with 260,000,000. VII. Miscellaneous groups with 2,074,000. And the nine parliamentary colonies are Canada, Newfoundland, the Cape, New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland, South Australia, Tasmania, and New Zealand.

The preferable plan seems to us to establish at once a representative federal advising council, which would grow in power and influence with the power and influence of the colonies, whilst it would inevitably weaken and depose what ought to be weakened and deposed, and which would gradually assume the constitutional expression and form as well as the supremacy of decision appropriate to its actual power.

The federal principle was really introduced into English politics in 1707 and 1801; for Scotland and Ireland, notwithstanding the corrupt *modus operandi* of the Union, became the means of its recognition. Surely we are elevated enough to see that modern statesmanship consists in appreciating and acknowledging the right that is clear, and the power that must preponderate, with as little fuss and nonsense as possible. We discount the inevitable future. "Before the nation," says Michelet, "found the commune, before the commune found the man, and so, of the larger unities, confederation must be preceded by federation." Whilst federal governments are directly related to individuals, a confederation has strictly only to do with governments and States; but the case of Ireland is peculiar in this, that her federal and other relations have to be settled at Westminster by a majority of the representatives of four nations, and are liable to be obstructed and vetoed by an hereditary, non-representative, anarchical second chamber of Irish and other landlords, who constitute a trades union against the Irish people, and whose occupation will be almost gone when federation comes. Peers are no more disposed than other people to commit happy despatch, and it may well happen with so burning a question that before the hurly-burly is over, chance, evil compromise, or desperation may have their share in misshaping some not altogether august decree.

Whilst, broadly speaking, peers and Irish landlords are the consistent enemies of every Irish interest, peers necessarily combine in themselves every disqualification for impartial judgment of Imperial problems. That is to say, they are exactly where and what they

ought not to be. And it is one of the best illustrations of the depth, and breadth, and universality of the Irish question, that perhaps the oldest feature of the British constitution—not a second chamber, but the peers' chamber—is involved in it. The right of veto is a right of sovereignty, and we shall soon want to know whether peers are to be sovereign over king, commons, and empire, and if so when they conquered us all? From the necessities of their position as heirs of “the grantees of confiscation,” or of the hundred and forty vendors of Irish rights whom Pitt ennobled, they prejudge Irish rights, whether of land or nation, whilst as peers they condemn the principle of representation, obstruct the formation of an Imperial representative chamber, and must and will do the utmost possible harm to England, Ireland, and the Empire. There is no possible scheme of Imperial representation that would not either dwarf these sons of privilege in their own House, or else leave them out in the cold by concentrating Imperial power elsewhere. We desire to show in the clearest manner what every Liberal in the country should understand—that the majority of our Upper House are natural born enemies of the Irish land and nation; that their very existence obstructs the formation of a proper House which should be the centre and home of confederation; that they are in fine the destroyers of Empire and Union. The Irish land question, therefore, as also those of Home Rule and Federation, is intimately connected with the question—What shall be done with the Lords? Thirty or forty years ago the Lords threw out a clause of the Australian Government Act, which empowered the Crown to summon a general assembly of the colonies desirous of legislating on matters of common interest; and although now the Lords are finding their level, it is not much use passing laws to free Ireland and unify the Empire whilst the Lords' veto remains. The initiative and the veto are the two symbols of sovereignty; the Lords and the people oppose one another; and to leave the veto in the hands of a class having at the present day no *raison d'être* is at once unmeaning, immoral, and revolutionary. As things stand now, the question is, shall Ireland and the Empire be undone, or shall the House of Lords be remodelled? There ought to be small hesitation as to the answer. The unity of our Empire is a fact, and should be seen and dealt with as well as known of all men, and have a sign and a symbol as well as a soul. The two really Imperial forces—popular representation and statesmanlike intellect—must come to the front in England, and let it be seen that the great day of construction is at hand. The peers' house should be, not destroyed, but reconstructed on the true principle of function and representation, and on a scale bearing some proportion to our actual Empire. As Alfred made an England out of shires, so let Gladstone make a greater England out of nations. England's power depends upon her remaining the legi-

timate centre of these nations; while, on the other hand, it is only by uniting with England that the colonies can unite with one another. Now a House of Peers which represents no constituency, office, or function, with interests locked up in English land, and principles wrapped up in primogeniture and privilege, cannot in the nature of things be an Imperial Federal House of legislation for nations in every latitude, some of them twenty times larger than England, and in the heart of the great thoroughfares of the future. The reign of the happy-go-luckies must end. We must popularize ideas a little in advance of middle class opinion if we would enact them at all in advance of disaster. The supreme question now for England, and the greatest question before the whole world, is, —How shall we organize our Imperial federated democracy, beginning with Ireland? It has now no organization at all. Peers, landlords, lawlords, bishops—standing as such for property and heredity, caste and prejudice, not to say cant—against the free-thinking and acting members of the work-a-day world, how can they represent the manhood of mighty Empires? In comparison their poor House of Lords is but an obscure local agency, and is doomed to an inevitable extinction, unless it can re-emerge, swept and garnished, as the grand council of Imperial representation.

What, then, is demanded on all hands is a fair share first of national and then of Imperial citizenship for those who are prepared to receive it, for those who already share its dangers, and bear the burdens, and are therefore qualified to possess its honours—for those, in fine, who are offered the same things by our rivals and possible foes, and who will soon be able to extort it from us.

What wonder that this Empire-question stirs men's passions and excites men's jealousies! John Bull's estate is an Empire consisting of six vast empires, continents of gold, corn, and cattle, and comprising one-third of the habitable globe, and one-fourth of its population. Moreover it transacts one-third of the world's trade. Its language is becoming universal, that of France and other nations provincial; for English is the tongue of a free thought, and of free religion, of free constitutions and free trade. Its area exceeds 5,260,000 square miles. It has been lately stated that, taking France, Germany, and English-speaking nations with their present rate of progression, at the end of two centuries the last may number 1837 millions against 157 millions of Germans, and 73 millions of Frenchmen. And if these numbers are too large there is no doubt that, according to the tables of density of population, our Empire may one day contain 1,200,000,000 of English citizens. Look also at the position of England herself, but one-eight-hundredth part of her own empire's area, yet the centre and basis of this awful embodiment of power! We talked just now of five millions of square miles—Great Britain and Ireland have but

120,000. It is the mighty spirit of English citizenship that animates the mass, and may make it broad based like the pyramids and eternal. But that spirit cries aloud for a body, a form, an organization, commensurate with itself, for a confederation of dimensions to suit the new fact, new expression for a new world and a new gospel for a new religion.

To come a little more closely to facts, Canada and Australia have one-seventh of the population, one-third of the revenue, one-fifth of the debt, and one-fifth of the trade of the United Kingdom. Canada has 3,470,392 square miles, Queensland 668,222, South Australia 900,000, New Zealand 104,000, and Great Britain only 120,000. How long, we ask, and why will the men of the 5,142,616 square miles, whose very excess over the 5,000,000 is much more than England's area—how long and why should they be left out in the cold by England? Why should the *plus* be dictated to by the *minus*?

Shall we then attempt to make of England and Ireland one nation, which they never were and never can be, and insist on a scheme, which, destroying national life, cannot build up Empire? Or shall we make our Empire by building up the nations? Shall we have one Parliament for the home nations, or shall we have an Irish Parliament, with direct federal relations between it and all our nations?

Let us look steadily at the difficulties of federation, till we have distinguished the real from the imaginary. Virtually we are already a century in advance of Mr. Goldwin Smith and his dream or drivel of 1867, in which year he declared "political union" with the colonies "a dream, and one from which we shall soon awake," and advocated as his own nostrum, "colonial emancipation," by which he meant Imperial disruption.

Strange to say the colonies don't want to be "emancipated" out of the blessings and glories of Empire. There is at this moment a real spirit of union between the colonies and ourselves, and all we have to do is to find out the right constitutional form or expression of this momentous fact. It is not the soul—the life—that has to be created, but only the body or organization. How different the principles which foster national and Imperial growth from the partisanship that confounds arbitrary connection with real union, and that, ignoring the natural and scientific order of things, really fosters separation! In Ireland and the other dependencies there exists a real life-basis in this spirit of British citizenship. Let us build on it. Further, citizenship, like nationality, contains a real "moral essence." Let us avail ourselves of it. Now the appeal lies to the people—the preponderating power in the English State. Let the people bethink themselves what is the best guarantee of order, right, and progress.

It is time, indeed, to shatter that statesmanship of chaos, thimble-rigging, and despair which calls separation union and union separation, and pretends that justice cannot conciliate. If Great Britain is

to be united we must begin with Ireland ; if the Empire is to be federated we must begin with Ireland. When the last Reform Bill transferred power to the people, the English nation came of age, and the home kingdom became assured. Having founded the nation on that which is alone imperial—its manhood—all things henceforth are possible, even to creating an Imperial democratic confederation of all the Britains. To this achievement we advance not alone as individuals but as municipalities ; not alone as municipalities but as a nation ; and not alone as a nation but as a confederation of Anglo-Saxon empires ; and we advance with an impulse as mighty as gravitation, to a destiny wide as humanity itself.

This growth of our power may be fate, but it surely also may become a triumph of justice ; a triumph of men free in body and soul over other races who are more subject to the intermeddling of State, Church, or Bureaucrat, and who never from birth to death can untwine from their throats the everlasting grip of the spy and of the priest.

These national individualities, these mighty conglomerates of power, these Imperial unities, these confederated Empires vitalized by human endeavour, are the most sacred embodiment of the universal life, nor is it a small matter that the greatest Empire in the world is also democratic and English, or that its chief offspring, the American Empire, sprang full armed from us at our noblest epoch, and is one with us in race, blood, history, and ideas. The wielding influence in this English State—*i.e.*, the majority vote and the universal consensus, which are the sword, sceptre, and crown of the new dispensation, as it exists, must do its work. Itself created, it has in turn to create.

If the Empire founded under Elizabeth and Cromwell, and extended under Victoria—if the principles and policy taught by the greatest and noblest souls in England present and past—if all our national life is to culminate in a gospel of vanity and selfishness, then may politics well be abandoned to war jingoes, to prancing pro-consuls, or hop-o'-my-thumb Irish secretaries, and the really Imperial-minded Englishmen retire from the scene ! Yet even to these latter we would venture to say, " If you want to know what nature and manhood have done together in this world, look all around at the English race and the English-speaking Empires."

Si monumentum quæris circumspice. For there " mightier powers have been at work than expediency ever called up—yea, mightier than the understanding can comprehend."

From all our past there seems the promise of an Imperial federated democracy of unmatched proportions and power, and thus and thus alone will there be scope enough for the characters of an immeasurable future ; but base and sides and summit must be the work of the master builders of the epoch. It is an advance not only all along the line, but in all directions. It is, we say, an

immeasurable advance, moral, material, political; and yet it is this very subordination, organization, and hierarchy of the powers that according to Liberal Unionists are self-destructive. They object to the federal *régime* as leaving undone what on the largest scale it alone can do, and as disorganizing, insubordinating, and scattering, where it really organizes, subordinates and unites.

They might as reasonably allege that well disposed individuals make a disorderly family, orderly families disorderly communes, or these chaotic counties and municipalities, as that empires cannot be made nor nations federated, unless nature be annulled and national growths impaired. All organizations depend upon development, and all are really hierarchies. There is force in what Dean Swift, the first great champion of Irish nationality, said in his sermon on "Doing Good." "It is apparent from Scripture and reason that the safety and welfare of nations are under the most peculiar care of God's providence. Whoever attempts to breed confusion or disturbances among a people doth his utmost to take the government of the world out of God's hands, and to put it into the hands of the devil, who is the author of confusion. No crime against particular persons can equal the guilt of him who does injury to the public."

England has been the great nation builder, because she has best known how to make use of the two great nation-making agencies—morality and the family life. Americans were simply Englishmen and Irishmen who went abroad to avoid religious persecution, who asserted their independence against political tyranny, and taught the mother country that her education had not been in vain. England has never forgotten the lesson, notwithstanding that Tories and Unionists deny Ireland's nationality, and the nation at large is recognizing every day more and more the importance of the sister island's claim.

Now, therefore, we must either decline to the third rank or advance from nation making to empire making. The nations we have made demand home rule and federation, that they may have strength, security, and progress, and finally confederation. They demand and we demand that our present House of Commons, which is not their House of Commons, shall be supplemented by a real House of Empire, not a house of mortgagees and landlords, but an Imperial Second Chamber, in which the colonies shall be represented and become responsible for their own destiny. A new political world demands a new, political science, and the crisis which Burke predicted has come.

"My hold," said he, "on the colonies is in the close affection which grows from common names, from vindicated blood, from similar privileges and equal protection. These are the ties which, though light as air, are strong as links of iron. Let the colonies

always keep the idea of their civil rights associated with your government, they will cling and grapple to you, and no force under heaven will be of power to tear them from their allegiance; but let it be once understood that your government may be one thing, and their privileges another—that these two things may exist without any relation—the cement is gone, and everything hastens to decay and dissolution.”

And so things must hasten on to dissolution if “our government” and “their privileges” are at variance, for their privileges are the new life, and our government is the old form. If old England forms cannot get themselves decently buried, old England will have to go with them, and there will be no resurrection for either.

There are leading men among us with no conception of the federal principle, who still look on our blood-related colonies across the seas and on our next-door neighbour, Ireland, as rustics, who had never heard of country, looked at their rivals over the next village or communal border. For such men colonial representation is an empty cry, and England and Ireland are a pair of Kilkenny nationalities without statesmanship, civilization, or self-control, bound simply because they are neighbours, to weaken and destroy if not to kill and eat one another, instead of dwelling together as brethren in one common family, destined to become one natural centre of a vast association of such families.

Statesmanship, however, must march with the age and deal with our present actual interests, necessities, and opportunities. All our public men, whatever else they seem or do, are either “little Englanders” and insularists, working for the disruption of the Empire and the perdition of the State, or they are living and working members of the great, the greater, and the aggregate Britains standing for union and defence in one common bond of civilization and life.

This is the grand distinction now between the men of the dawn and the men of the night, between partisans with vested interests in the littleness and dismemberment of our Empire and those whose loyalty and largeness go to secure its future. This, then, is the very grammar of politics, the alpha and omega of our work; these are the principles, these the conditions of Empire. The temple of our English manhood must rise now in nobler proportions, and the proportions of social and political life will rise with it, for the mighty unknown future of both must be built up of manhood and be free. This it was that made us ready when the power of Philip came up across the bay of storms to blow the obscure clouds of superstition and subjection over our borders, which made us too strong for Elizabeth’s later dawdling, and strong enough even for Cromwell’s prime.

Gladstone deliberately gave power to the whole people, and trusts

in common sense applied to great questions by those who have no interest in abuses. Moved by the broad feelings of human nature, on which all law and statesmanship rest, he appeals, like Fox, on the question of the day, "to great principles and great passions for the government of a great country."

Professor J. R. Seeley, in *Our Colonial Expansion*, writes thus :—
 "The greatest English question of the future must be, what is to become of our second [colonial] Empire? and whether or no it may be expected to go the way of the first? Two alternatives are before us, and incomparably the greatest question which we can discuss refers to the choice between them. When we have accustomed ourselves to contemplate the whole Empire together and call it England, we shall see that here too is a United States—a great homogeneous people, one in blood, language, religion, and laws, but dispersed over a boundless space. But if we are disposed to doubt whether any system can be devised capable of holding together, &c., the United States have solved this problem. No doubt our problem has difficulties of its own, immense difficulties. But the greatest is one which we make for ourselves. It is a false preoccupation that the problem is insolvable."

These, then, are the great contentions. We say that the two political questions, nation and empire, are one in interest, and that the political and economic questions, nation and land, labour and rent, are questions of the nation's life. We say, moreover, that a nation can alone understand its own requirements, and how to satisfy them, and that Irish land law and Irish social and national life must be reconstructed not at Westminster but in Dublin. A nation must be self-made, home bred, and home ruled. Centuries of English misgovernment and Irish misery have stirred up passions which, as Burke said, go down to the depths of hell and rear their proud tops to heaven itself; and the Irish question is one of a far reaching policy of colossal interests, perhaps entailing desperate conflicts, but certainly destined to ultimate victory.

"Last year the question was, "Shall Ireland have Home Rule?" This year the question is, "What Home Rule shall Ireland have?" For one thing the home rule that Ireland will have is not likely to be fanciful or theoretic. It will be fashioned not out of blood and iron by our Lilliputian Bismarcks, but out of the inextinguishable patriotism of English and Irish citizens, and will be torn from the same senile and pitiless oligarchy which once lost America, which now is torturing the sister islands, and which is setting its own existence against justice and conciliation. Irish home rule is likely therefore to be grounded on a very wholesome principle—necessity; a principle, said Humboldt, "most in accordance with reverence for individuality and solicitude for freedom." The Irish nation, settled on the Irish land and uniting labour with ownership, will become,

like the United States, a territorial democracy. Rising from the broad foundation of an almost universal suffrage, with communal county, and provincial functions and rights fairly conceded and properly established, its equal nationality will stand with others between manhood and empire, recognizing the rights of all and "the predominance of that spirit of the whole" which, says Comte, "can alone constitute government, and must become more instead of less necessary as human development proceeds."

The Irish question, which everybody understood, and the Federal question, which nobody understood, suddenly coalesced as part of one problem, of which many were interested in muddling and obscuring the issues. In reality they had grown together. Thus, a newly enfranchized democracy was brought suddenly face to face with a stupendous problem and a vast opportunity, while yet no authoritative voice had pronounced the sesame which was to unlock the gate of solution, the English middle class and official mind being still impregnated with ideas of caste, authority, and sectarianism. The people, however, declined to be connoisseured out of their common sense, and they found the solution in that very separate parliament, and in that federal centre which Liberal Unionists would have sent them round on a fool's errand to avoid. Thus, when victory comes, it will be a victory of almost world-wide proportions and importance, a victory not only of home rule, but of Imperial and confederal unity, besides that of a permanent Liberal preponderance at Westminster, the promise and pledge of a hundred victories more. O'Connell's phalanx ranged only between twenty-six and forty-five; but the presence there of twice the latter number, so strenuously demanded by Liberal Unionists, may mean their own personal exclusion from power and place, as well as a complete shifting of the balance between the old political world and the new.

All hail, then, to the Liberal Unionist, or Illiberal Disunionist secession, because, although it has postponed the triumph of Irish right and of English justice, the delay is organizing the Liberal victory for at least a generation, and is educating an Imperial race in statesmanship and empire, for democratic organization and power. No doubt, party leaders who could not lead, have imported into Irish politics their own minds' anarchy, in the name of order and empire. But we understand all that. Worse once happened in Rome when other "honourable men," careful, as Shakespeare tells us, for liberty and empire,

"Showed their teeth like apes, and fawned like hounds,
Whilst damned Casca, like a cur, behind,
Struck Cæsar in the neck."

But our conspirators are only weak, washed-out copies of the Roman ones, and the country is beginning to discount the situation.

Of small avail is all that our opponents can do to prevent the issue, at last clearly before our countrymen.

In a word, Ireland may be, ought to be, and must be, the first fruits of that process of which the full harvest will be administrative and legislative Home Rule and Imperial unity throughout our whole dominions. To recognize Irish nationality is the great first step, taken in honesty and truth. "Justice to Ireland is salvation to the Empire."

But there are remoter dangers which cannot be lost sight of. It is not statesmanship to keep open such contingencies as a union of Ireland with the United States or Canada for certain mutual or common interests hostile to our own. The American-Irish hate us, and to all Americans our Irish policy seems as idiotic as it is despicable. Canada, as her nationality grows and is cemented, will demand with increasing urgency equal citizenship in some great empire. By choice it would now be the English, by invitation it may be the American, or, independently, it may be her own. She may accept it from her only neighbours, she could take it to-morrow for herself, and to-day she would welcome it federally from England. Have it she will. The same must be said of Australia. She will not long be British unless she can be Australian also, and she can be both only by federation. Sir Henry Parkes, the Premier of the South Wales Parliament, declared in debate, when moving the Address to the Crown on the 7th of September last, "there can be no federation except on a common basis of equality." It is equality in citizenship that is demanded alike by Canada and Australia, by the half of the North American continent, and by what has been called the "fifth quarter" of the world. Well, then, what blocks the way? Irish landlordism, the Peerage, and the Tories. The question is, are these three worth half a continent and the failure of federation? We have to deal with the situation which these obstructives have created. At the present moment they carry on the Government to keep up Irish rents, and with them Irish desperation, losing a century ago half of America in the cause of taxation without representation; what may these men not cost us to-day?

One word more. Federal arrangements and contracts have oftentimes been formed and entered into on the menace of some great and distinct danger which is sought to avoid. Are we waiting for that menace and that danger? Why should we not rather foresee and provide?

When the British Empire shall have one confederal centre, one fleet and army, as one parliament and one general policy, then, indeed, we may hope to dominate physical force by moral. What force would be sufficiently great to resist such a combination. It is to be hoped that, when our duty has been done, and our descendants ask respecting our then imperial constitution, as Coleridge of our past

national history : " Whence did this happy organization come ? Was it a tree transplanted from paradise with all its branches in full fruitage, or was it sowed in sunshine ; was it in vernal breezes and gentle rains that it fixed its roots, and grew, and strengthened," we may not have to answer : " With blood was it planted ; it was rocked with tempests ; the deep scars are on its trunk, and the path of the lightning may be traced amongst its higher branches." Be this as it may, we know that mightier powers are at work than expediency ever called up. " Has anything great or lasting been done," asks Emerson, " who did it ? Plainly not any man, but all men. It was the prevalence and inundation of an idea. The doctrine of this supreme presence is a cry of joy and exultation for him who seeth the admirable stars of possibility and the yet untouched continent of hope glittering with all its mountains in the vast West, or who would bask in the great morning which rises for ever out of the Eastern seas, seeking to be himself amongst the children of the light. I praise with wonder this great reality which seems to drown all things in the deluge of its light." *Sursum corda !* Let us apply these great words to England now. " Let those fear or fawn who may. Pusillanimity and fear are not for her who putteth on her coronation robes and goes out through universal love to universal power."

J. A. PARTRIDGE.

TIMOLEON, THE LIBERATOR OF SICILY.

If there is one discovery more than another on which the present age may congratulate itself, it is that it has found out that what is called ancient history is a living thing with a practical bearing.

The conventional way of looking at so-called classical times, as if the men who lived then were not creatures of the same flesh and blood as ourselves, which used to prevail, has long since been discarded by all real historians. We have learnt, as has been well said, that history is but past politics (not, of course, using the word in any narrow sense), and politics are only present history. And of no history is this truer than of the history of the commonwealths of Ancient Greece. There is no study more ennobling in itself and more fraught with valuable lessons for all times.

And the work of expounding such an inspiring text has been worthily indeed discharged by a historian of our land. We may be proud indeed as Englishmen that our country has given birth to the immortal work of Grote. The profound learning and research of this illustrious author are even less remarkable than his constant endeavour to bring out the truly living and practical character of Grecian history.

No one has more vehement sympathies with everything good and noble, a more passionate love of justice and freedom, or a keener hatred of tyranny and oppression.

Every reader of his pages must have felt his soul fired within him in perusing many portions of his story, and no part surely is calculated to arouse a more thrilling interest than the narrative of the career of one of the noblest and purest characters, not only in ancient, but in any history—Timoleon, the deliverer of Sicily from domestic tyranny and foreign oppression.

The slight sketch which is here attempted lays no claim to originality of treatment, but is merely an effort to put in a shorter and more popular form the history of this great man as told by Mr. Grote.

Timoleon, son of Timodemos, was born of a noble family in the city of Corinth. His character was from early days distinguished both by bravery in the field and by extreme kindness and gentleness of disposition among his friends and relations at home. He was noted for his attachment to the constitution of his country and his

hatred of all tyrants and traitors. Of this he was destined to give a signal proof before long.

His elder brother, Timophanes, was possessed of equally great natural powers both of body and mind, and of more energy and ambition; but he utterly lacked the unselfishness and high moral principle which were so marked in Timoleon. The latter had, however, apparently a strong affection for his brother, and on one occasion saved his life in battle at the risk of his own. Timophanes, as the older and more ambitious of the two brothers, naturally took the more prominent part in the affairs of the State, and his younger brother never thought of envying him his superior distinction as long as his ambition was confined within the limits proper to a citizen of a free community. It was, however, the fatal temptation of too many eminent Greeks to strive after more power than the laws of their country allowed them, and to its influence Timophanes surrendered himself with disgraceful eagerness. Having been placed in the command of mercenary soldiers in the service of the State, he made use of them to seize upon the citadel and establish himself as tyrant or despot of Corinth. We find it difficult to realize all that this name implied to Grecian ears. It meant, not merely a bad ruler, but a ruler whose power rested on the subversion of all laws, being founded on terror and brute force. Such a one could hardly govern well, even if he had wished, and scarcely any one whose aims were not utterly selfish would have sought after such a hateful position. Timophanes appears to have been one of the worst specimens of a bad class. He put citizens to death wholesale without any form of trial: he committed all the outrages and excesses for which unlimited power gave the opportunity.

The feelings of a man like Timoleon at seeing his country thus crushed and degraded at the hands of his own brother may easily be imagined. Again and again did he remonstrate with him on the wickedness of his conduct, and beseech him to lay down his usurped authority, but met only with scornful refusals. At last he made a final attempt to move the infatuated despot to reason, accompanied by the brother-in-law of Timophanes and one or two other friends: they renewed their entreaties, but were again laughed to scorn, whereupon some of them drew their swords, and put the tyrant to death. Timoleon had no active part in the deed, but stood aside with his face covered and bathed in tears. Of his conduct in this matter very opposite judgments have been formed in ancient and modern times. Ancient writers, with hardly any difference of opinion, praise him for preferring his country to his brother; many modern ones brand him as a fratricide.

In judging of his action we must remember that Greek sentiment looked upon a tyrant (the destroyer of the liberties of a free State) in the same light that we regard a pirate upon the high seas—viz., as

an enemy of the human race whom it was meritorious to kill whenever possible. He who had trampled all law under his feet was not considered as entitled to its protection, and, since the very greatness of his crimes had rendered it impossible to execute justice upon him in a formal and regular manner, the only remedy was summary vengeance at the hands of some outraged citizen. Whatever we may think of the ancient view, we venture to say that, if tried by the modern standard of morality, it certainly compares favourably with the manner in which such deliberate perjury and cold-blooded massacres as were committed by Napoleon III., a worthy representative of Timophanes, were condoned by the sovereigns of Europe.

Even if Timoleon had killed his brother with his own hands, his conduct would not have been unlike certain acts which are recorded with approval in the Old Testament and defended by orthodox divines; and what he did was merely to abstain from interfering when others meted out to the despot, who had despised all warnings, the due reward of his crimes. He was evidently deeply grieved at the event, but regarded it as a sad necessity. And the results of the action were certainly beneficial to Corinth. By the merited death of one man the State was delivered from a vile tyranny, and its free constitution was restored without any further bloodshed or disorder.

Nevertheless, though Timoleon never regretted the part he had taken in the action which delivered Corinth, the tragic event could not fail to be a source of grief to him, and for many years he abstained altogether from public life. He was at length aroused from his retirement by a call to a most noble, but at the same time most arduous, duty. The groans of the oppressed people of Syracuse were sounding loudly in the ears of the mother city of Corinth, and the parent could not resist the entreaties of her suffering child.

This famous city, the greatest of the Greek colonies in Sicily, had for more than sixty years been experiencing almost every degree of calamity. Once a free democracy, it had been ground down beneath the heel of an atrocious despotism. The infamous Dionysios had by his vile arts and hired mercenaries subverted, like Timophanes, the constitution of his country, and his dominion was unfortunately more lasting than that of Timophanes. For forty years he had tyrannized over Syracuse, and many other once free Greek cities had succumbed to the force of his arms. He had been succeeded by his son, the younger Dionysios, whose weaker character seemed to offer some hopes of overthrowing the despotism. The task had been attempted by an influential citizen of Syracuse, Dion, a friend and correspondent of Plato, the philosopher. He had at first been successful. Dionysios was expelled, and Syracuse might have regained its freedom, but

unfortunately Dion, like so many other eminent Greeks, was not proof against the temptations of prosperity. Instead of restoring liberty to his country as he had promised, he persuaded himself that his fellow-citizens were unfit for freedom, and that he would do them most good by ruling them as a philosophical despot. Placed in this false position his descent from the heights of virtue was fatally rapid. He soon began to fall into the usual crimes of a Greek tyrant, and had already made himself thoroughly odious to the people whose deliverer he had once sincerely hoped to be, when he was assassinated. His death was followed by a period of frightful anarchy and confusion, which almost made the Syracusans regret the stern and harsh rule of the elder Dionysios. There were continual faction fights in the streets of the city between the followers of various party leaders, all equally unscrupulous, and aiming at nothing but to grasp the tyranny for themselves. The younger Dionysios managed to return and establish himself in Ortygia, the harbour and inner quarter of the city. The outer city was a scene of mere bloodshed and disorder, and at last fell to a large extent under the influence of Hiketas, despot of the neighbouring town of Leontini, one of the most treacherous and unprincipled ruffians by which the ill-fated island of Sicily was afflicted in that fearful time. Among other atrocities, he had treacherously murdered the wife and sister of Dion. Not only was Syracuse in a miserable condition, but the fate of the rest of the island was scarcely more enviable. Almost every Greek city was in the hands of some cruel and blood-thirsty tyrant, while in addition to all this the Carthaginians, the hereditary enemies of the Greeks, were taking advantage of the distracted state of the latter to endeavour to extend their sway. They had gathered great forces, and had subjugated many Greek cities. Syracuse itself was threatened. It seemed as if, not only freedom, but Hellenism itself would be extinct on the island. In this scene of dismay and desolation we shall see a marvellous change wrought by the single-minded efforts of one noble and heroic soul.

The Syracusans in their distress, having Dionysios established in a strong fortress in their midst, and being at the same time threatened by the Carthaginians, appealed for succour to the parent city of Corinth. To this invitation of Corinthian aid Hiketas was a party, but an unwilling one. His real object was to expel Dionysios by the help of the Carthaginians, and to establish himself as tyrant of Syracuse in dependence upon them.

The invitation reached Corinth at a favourable moment, and a resolution was unanimously come to, to grant the aid required. There was great difficulty, however, in finding a leader for an enterprise of much danger and little profit, and several leading citizens refused the command of the expedition. At last the post was offered to

Timoleon, and accepted by him. The force with which he set out was not large, amounting to little over 1000 men, and, even before the preparations were complete, news arrived which seemed to render the chances of success almost desperate. A message was received from Hiketas withdrawing his former demand for Corinthian assistance, and announcing that he had entered into an alliance with the Carthaginians. Great indignation was felt in Corinth at his treachery, which seemed to make the enterprise of Timoleon hopeless. He could hardly hope even to reach Sicily in the face of a powerful Carthaginian fleet. Nevertheless, he never dreamt of drawing back, and succeeded in firing his soldiers with an enthusiasm equal to his own. He managed by a stratagem to evade the hostile fleet, and reached the town of Tauromenion in Sicily. Even there, however, it seemed as if his difficulties were only beginning. Hiketas was besieging the harbour of Syracuse, in conjunction with a Carthaginian force, most of the Sicilian towns were under despots in alliance with him; the Syracusans were powerless to afford any effectual aid. In these circumstances Timoleon saw that his best chance was to strike a blow boldly and promptly before his enemies were expecting him.

He lay in wait for the forces of Hiketas in a mountain pass on the way to Syracuse, took them by surprise and completely routed them. After this victory he marched up to the walls of Syracuse. The whole city, with the exception of the stronghold of Ortygia, was in the possession of Hiketas, who with his Carthaginian allies was besieging Dionysios. Timoleon's task was to expel both and restore liberty to the city, a work which seemed arduous enough. Before long fortune threw a great boon in his way. Dionysios, despairing of holding his position against two enemies, surrendered Ortygia to Timoleon, stipulating only for safe conveyance and shelter at Corinth. Timoleon accepted the offer of surrender, and occupied Ortygia with a detachment of his forces. The fallen tyrant was sent in a ship of war to Corinth, where he spent the remainder of his days as a schoolmaster. The impression produced by this great success on the Corinthian mind was very great. The expedition of Timoleon had been considered as a desperate venture, and no one even of its friends had anticipated so rapid a success. A large reinforcement was immediately voted. Much, however, yet remained to be done. The greater part of Syracuse was still in the hands of Hiketas, who had introduced a large Carthaginian force within the walls, a degradation which the once proud city had never before experienced. The small Corinthian garrison of Ortygia was beset by vastly superior forces both by sea and land. Soon, however, the new troops from Corinth arrived to the aid of Timoleon, whose force now amounted to 4000, still but a slender number against the overwhelming hosts of his foes. His usual good fortune, however, di-

not fail him. A quarrel broke out between Hiketas and his Carthaginian allies, who with good reason doubted the fidelity of one who had proved so false to his own countrymen. The upshot was that the whole Carthaginian force sailed away to Africa with the fleet. Timoleon, finding the greater part of his enemies thus departed, made a vigorous attack on the position of Hiketas, utterly routed him, and drove him in disgraceful flight to his own city of Leontini. All Syracuse was now in his hands. And now the true greatness of his character was to be manifested. He had already shown himself a brave and successful general, he was now to prove himself superior to the temptations to which his predecessor Dion and so many other eminent Greeks had succumbed. It would have been easy enough for him to make himself the absolute master of Syracuse. Most people in Sicily expected that he probably would avail himself of the opportunity, and many of his friends even must have urged him to such a course. Nor would there be wanting those pernicious sophisms by which even in our own times much worse acts of usurpation have been palliated. The Syracusans, it might be urged, after being in servitude so long, were totally unfit for freedom, it would be far better for them to submit to the rule of a wise and just master like Timoleon.

Such suggestions may very probably have crossed his mind, but his noble soul repelled them as they deserved. The first step he took was to invite all the Syracusans to demolish the citadel constructed as the great bulwark of his tyranny by the elder Dionysios. This hateful stronghold of despotism was pulled down amid universal rejoicing. A new constitution was drawn up on a free democratic basis, and settlers were invited from all quarters to re-people the city, which was impoverished and desolate after the long period of oppression and suffering it had undergone. Timoleon had, of course, a large share in the framing of these arrangements, but his singular disinterestedness is shown by the fact that he refused to accept any permanent office for himself, though there was no place which a grateful people would have thought too high for their glorious deliverer.

There was still much work for him to do. It was his object to free, not only Syracuse, but all the Greek cities of Sicily. He first attacked Hiketas at Leontini, and forced him to lay down his usurped authority, and restore freedom to the city. He was, however, permitted to live in the town as a private citizen, a clemency which he, as will be seen, scandalously abused. Several other deepots were also expelled. Sicily seemed at last to have a prospect of rest and peace, but not yet was this hope to be realized.

The submission of Hiketas had only been feigned in order to gain time to persuade the Carthaginians to invade Sicily again. His conduct is very similar to that of Charles I. in inviting the Scotch

army into England in 1648 while pretending to treat with the parliament. The Carthaginians lent a ready ear to the messages of this worthless traitor; not that they placed any confidence in him, but they no doubt calculated that after Timoleon had been overthrown it would be easy enough to deal with Hiketas. An immense army and fleet were collected with the object of entirely subjugating the island to the sway of Carthage. The numbers of the army amounted to 70,000 men, consisting, not as usual with Carthaginian forces, of mercenaries only, but containing no less than 10,000 picked native infantry. Timoleon could assemble only 12,000 men to meet them; but, with the confidence of a good cause, he did not wait to be attacked in Syracuse, but boldly advanced against the enemy. The decisive battle was fought at the river Krimesos. After a spirit-stirring address from Timoleon, the Greek soldiers charged against the formidable array opposed to them. The war-chariots, in which the Carthaginians placed their greatest reliance, were broken by the impetuous attacks of the Greeks, who were greatly aided by a violent storm of rain and wind, which came in their backs and blew straight in the faces of their adversaries. The result was one of the most complete triumphs which right has ever gained over might. The Carthaginian army was utterly routed and broken in pieces; the Sacred Band, comprising 2500 soldiers of the chief noble families in Carthage, was destroyed almost to a man, and Timoleon returned in triumph to Syracuse with great spoil. The traitor Hiketas now remained to be dealt with, and his punishment was not long delayed. He was surrendered by his own soldiers, and expiated his crimes, like Charles I., on the scaffold. The same well-merited fate, after public trial, befell Mamerkos, the tyrant of the city of Katana. Two more tyrants only remained in Greek cities, who were both speedily expelled, and Timoleon had now accomplished his glorious task. Every Greek community in Sicily was now emancipated from the sway of despots, and enjoyed freedom and peace. The exploits of Timoleon seem almost like those of some hero of romance slaying dragons and giants. He had, as Archbishop Trench puts it in his fine poem on the subject contained in a number of *Macmillan's Magazine*, to fight against "worse than wild beasts," and nobly had he overcome them all. His work was finished, his unselfishness was conspicuously shown by his resigning his command of General of the Syracusan forces. For the rest of his life he lived as a private citizen in the city he had delivered, declining all official functions. He was still, however, frequently consulted on occasions of difficulty, both by the Syracusans and by the other cities in Sicily, and it was indeed an inestimable blessing for them to possess so wise and disinterested a counsellor in the many questions which called for settlement. Much had to be done to repair the effects of the years of oppression. New settlers had to be invited and new constitutional

arrangements framed, and in all this work Timoleon had a large share. He was, in the true sense of that much-abused phrase, a "saviour of society."

Few things in all history are so touching as the picture of his last years at Syracuse. His sight had entirely failed, and when his presence was desired in the public assembly, his car was drawn by attendants to the place of meeting, and his arrival was the occasion for the most vehement demonstrations of affection, the people hailing him with well-deserved applause as their father and benefactor. Having delivered his opinion on the matter in question, his car was again drawn away in the same manner, similar demonstrations accompanying his departure. How much more truly great does this unselfish patriot appear, with his throne in the hearts of the people he had saved, than the proudest despot with his myriads of hirelings to prop up his ill-gotten dominion. The funeral of Timoleon was an impressive spectacle. It was celebrated magnificently at the public cost, and was attended by crowds, not merely from Syracuse, but from all parts of Sicily. A long procession of men and women followed the bier, crowned with wreaths, to do honour to their departed liberator. The words of the proclamation made by the herald at the moment when the torch was applied to the pile, furnish the best commentary on the life which thus closed: "The Syracusan people solemnize, at the cost of 200 minae, the funeral of this man, the Corinthian Timoleon, son of Timodemos. They have passed a vote to honour him for all future time with festival matches in music, horse and chariot races, and gymnastics; because, after having put down the tyrants, subdued the foreign enemy, and re-colonized the greatest among the ruined cities, he restored to the Sicilian Greeks their constitution and laws." A monument bearing this inscription was erected to his memory. No one could wish for a nobler memorial than these few simple words which put to shame the lengthy and mendacious panegyrics too often inscribed on the graves of departed despots.

Even this brief sketch may, it is to be hoped, give the reader some idea of the grandeur of one of the noblest characters in all history. In truth, in all the centuries between the days of Timoleon and our own, there are only one or two men worthy to be set beside him. No other prominent statesman, even in the best days of Grecian freedom, displayed a character so entirely single-minded, so absolutely uncorrupted by success. How small beside him appear even the greatest of Roman worthies. None of them were actuated by so unselfish a love of justice and freedom, even those who were comparatively free from mere personal ambition had no higher aim than the aggrandisement of their own state, and hardly any even of the best of them had any scruples as to the means they employed to gain their ends. In the more modern history of the world we have to

search long and far to find the equal of this noble hero of the ancient world. In fact, it may be said, that only three names merit any comparison with his, those of Alfred, of William the Silent, and of Washington. The personal character and abilities of the greatest of English kings were not unlike those of Timoleon; and his struggle against the Danes may be paralleled with the contest of the latter against the Carthaginians, both in its apparent hopelessness at first, and in its complete success. But the likeness is confined to the strife with the foreign invader; there is nothing analogous in Alfred's life to Timoleon's overthrow of the Greek tyrants, worse even than Carthaginians or Danes. And Alfred had not, like Timoleon, such an opportunity of showing his complete disinterestedness by laying down his power. As the king of a people who had always been accustomed to a kingly government, duty called upon him not to resign, but to retain his position; though all we know of him justifies us in asserting that in Timoleon's circumstances he would have acted as Timoleon acted. With William of Orange the parallel is somewhat closer. He, too, had to contend with domestic as well as foreign enemies; for it was not only by Spanish arms, but by the aid of traitors and slaves among the Netherlanders themselves, that Philip II. held the Netherlands down. The odds against him were, perhaps, even greater than against Timoleon; probably, though as great a statesman, he was not so great a general as the Greek. Certainly, for a victory like that of the Krimesos we should have to turn, not to any event in his life, but to the exploits of his son, totally unworthy as is the latter in every other respect of being brought for a moment into such a comparison.

That William's equally heroic efforts were never in his lifetime crowned with such complete success as Timoleon achieved, is of course no more to his discredit than it at all detracts from the fame of the liberator of Sicily, that his work in its fulness lasted only for a generation, while William's labours continued to bear fruit with great increase after his death. Without in any way questioning the absolute unselfishness of the founder of the Dutch Commonwealth in declining the supreme authority which the people repeatedly pressed upon him, it may be doubted whether his temptations were ever quite as strong as those of Timoleon must have been. He was never within reach of such a position of complete and undisturbed supremacy as the latter might easily have secured after the defeat of the Carthaginians and the expulsion of all the Greek tyrants in Sicily.

And glorious as was William's whole later career, we must not forget that there was a time when he was the courtier of such an execrable tyrant as Charles V., who was at least as bad as Timophanes or Hiketas, while his son, to whom for a time the Prince of Orange

professed devoted allegiance, was certainly much worse. Splendidly, indeed, was this youthful weakness redeemed, but still we can hardly fancy Timoleon accepting such a position for a moment.

George Washington is, again, in the elevation and nobility of his character worthy to rank even with the deliverer of Syracuse. His success, if not quite so rapid, was as complete and more lasting. But it cannot be said that he had ever to contend against quite so overwhelming odds, even when the Americans stood alone, and certainly after France and Spain had joined them there can be no comparison between Washington's difficulties and those which Timoleon so brilliantly overcame. His enemies, too, utterly in the wrong as they were, can hardly be placed in the same class with the "worse than wild beasts" whom Timoleon had to lay low. It would be as unjust to George III. and Lord North to compare them with Dionysios, Hiketas, and Mamerkos as it would be to even such ruffians as the latter to liken them to such fiends in human form as Philip II. and Alva.

And though it is impossible to conceive Washington under any circumstances ever harbouring the thought of making himself his country's tyrant, it may be doubted whether at any time it would have been at all easy for him to do so. Certainly he never had such a tempting opportunity as was presented to Timoleon. But it is not sought in these brief comparisons to diminish in the slightest degree the well-earned fame of any of these noblest of the noble of mankind. Rather, by setting their names beside each other, do we bring out more clearly the shining virtues of all. It would, indeed, be a worthy subject for those who love to frame imaginary conversations of the illustrious dead, to picture a meeting of these four great champions of right and freedom. But he who would take in hand to treat worthily of such moral giants must be a genius indeed. Of such as these it may in very truth be said, "The path of the just is as a shining light which shineth more and more unto the perfect day."

THE PRESENT POSITION OF THE EDUCATION QUESTION.

EVER since the Royal Commission on Elementary Education issued their report last year the complaints raised by the advocates of denominational education about the supposed disadvantages under which their schools labour have waxed daily louder and more vehement. We are told that they are being crushed out of existence by the competition of the Board schools; that the increasing demands made by the Education Department are such that Voluntary managers cannot meet them unless they receive additional financial aid from the public purse; that, instead of being on an equality with the Board schools, they are placed in a position of inferiority; that the Act of 1870, which was only intended to supplement Voluntary effort, is in fact supplanting it, and so forth. On all sides is heard the chorus of lamentation—from Parliament, from Convocation, from the press, from the pulpit, rises the cry that the schools of the Church of England are in danger, and must shortly perish unless something be done to save them.

In the cloud of dust raised by this controversy some facts are lost sight of which it is well to recall to mind.

First, then, how far is it true that the competition of the School Boards has checked or hindered the spread of the voluntary system? In 1870 there were in the Voluntary schools places for 1,878,000 children; last year there were 3,559,000 places. In other words, the accommodation in the Voluntary schools has nearly doubled itself during the last eighteen years. In those districts where there is no School Board—that is to say, in rather more than one-third of England and Wales, reckoning by population, but in probability about two-thirds reckoning by area, there is practically no check on the increase of schools so long as there are children to go to them, since any school that is certified as efficient and can show an average attendance of thirty children for a year can claim the Grant, subject to a slight restriction, applicable only to thinly-populated districts. But, say the Voluntarists, where there is a Board in existence we cannot open new schools, however much they may be wanted. On the contrary, even in School Board districts there is practically full freedom of expansion. The Boards are very sensitive to the accusation of extravagance, and are, as a rule, far too ready to relieve themselves from the duty of providing the necessary school accommodation;

and, as a matter of fact, between the years 1870 and 1886 the grant was refused, in School Board districts, only to 18 Church of England and 20 Roman Catholic new schools in England and Wales,¹ and of these several have been subsequently admitted to, and are now in receipt of, an annual grant. In other words, the English and Roman Churches have each been prevented from opening, in School Board districts, about one school a year. In the face of these figures it can hardly be said that the School Boards, in their present sporadic state, have been any serious hindrance to the spread of the Voluntary system.

Another complaint is that the demands of the Education Department for greater efficiency are becoming more stringent, and that the Voluntary managers cannot meet them without increased financial support in the shape of rates or additional Government grants. The Convocation of Canterbury, for example, resolved at their Session of 28th of February last:—

“That whenever additional cost is imposed upon school managers by public authorities, such additional cost, or a part thereof, should be provided by an addition to any Grant from the Education Department.”

And the Government were forced to yield to the pressure put upon them by a section of their supporters and to withdraw the draft Code of this year, which would have done something to improve the quality of education, avowedly because the Church of England declared itself unable to meet the additional expense thereby entailed.

It would appear incredible, were it not unhappily true, that the wealthiest Church in Christendom, professing as it does to believe that only in its own schools can the children be taught those principles which are necessary to the morality and education of the good citizen, should set its face against improvements whose need is acknowledged on all sides, even by the members of that Church, because some additional expense is involved in carrying them out. And yet it will be found that at all the numerous meetings held by the supporters of Church schools at which the new Code was discussed, the financial question always occupied the foremost place, and to it were subordinated all other considerations. Want of space forbids the quotation of any large number of extracts from the proceedings of these meetings, but the following may suffice for a specimen. The National Society began their memorial on the Code by saying that

“The recommendations of the majority [of the Royal Commission] involving increased expenditure, have been accepted as equivalent to similar recommendations of the minority, while the corresponding proposals for increased help have been dropped out of sight.”

The Congress of the General Association of Church School

¹ First Report of Royal Commission, p. 527.

Managers and Teachers, under the presidency of Archdeacon Farrar, carried as their first resolution—

“That no new Code can be deemed thoroughly satisfactory unless accompanied by a Government measure abolishing the 17s. 6d. limit and the rating of school buildings, and dealing with such other points as require legislative enactment.”

The Convocation of Canterbury resolved, in May—

“That the Report of the Education Commission led the friends of Voluntary schools to hope that some relief would be given to the supporters of Voluntary schools, but the New Code, by its regulations, seems to increase the burden of such supporters.”

At their Session of February, the same body debated at considerable length the Report of the Royal Commission; and throughout the discussion, as reported in the *Guardian*, hardly one word was said about how the Church schools could be rendered more efficient; the only points deemed worthy of consideration being the question of expense and the necessity for instruction in dogmatic religion. The *Guardian*, in its leading article of the 13th of March, commented in severe terms on the general tone of the debate, and on the “very low ideals of education” held by the great body of Churchmen. “Royal Commissions may come and Royal Commissions may go,” said that journal, “but the Church has nothing to say to education except that she must control it and that it must include religious instruction.” It has been made abundantly clear that the Church of England will oppose every and any reform of elementary education which is not accompanied by increased grants of public money in some form or other, and, in fact, the *School Guardian*, the organ of the National Society, said as much in plain terms. Writing, on the 21st of September, on the withdrawal of the draft Code, that journal said—

“The difficulties of the Voluntary schools will go on increasing, and no Code that disregards them, still less no Code that augments them, will meet with general acceptance.”

In the direction of additional aid the proposal which finds most favour is that mentioned in one of the resolutions quoted above—namely, the repeal of the clause in the Act of 1876, which provides that the Government Grant to any school shall not exceed 17s. 6d. per head in average attendance, or the income of the school from all other sources, whichever is the larger amount. An attempt was made last Session to carry out this policy, and a Bill was introduced by Mr. Powell to raise the limit of 17s. 6d. to 20s. What would be the effect of this measure? If we may judge by past experience, the money so obtained would go to the relief of the subscribers, and not to the improvement of education. In 1876, up to which year the limit of the Grant was the income of the school, the average Grant to Church of England schools was 12s. 1d.; in 1888 it was 17s. 0½d., or, say, 5s. higher. During the same period (1876–1888)

the fees in these schools were raised 8*d.* per head, making an increase of income of 5*s.* 8*d.*; and yet the total increase of income is only 3*s.* 2*d.*, the subscriptions having fallen from 9*s.* 6*d.* per head in 1876 to 7*s.* in 1888. Had the subscribers even continued their contributions at the rate of 1876 the managers would have had ample funds at their disposal to meet all the requirements of the draft Code. But because, as the Parliamentary Grant rose the subscriptions fell *pro tanto*, the money was not forthcoming, and the Code had therefore to be shelved.

We hear a great many complaints about schools being "fined" in their Grant by the operation of the 17*s.* 6*d.* limit, as though the Government agreed to pay a certain sum for education provided, and then capriciously deducted a portion of the promised income. This argues ignorance or forgetfulness of what the Government Grant is. It is not a payment from the State for value received in education of the children, but a grant *in aid of local effort*. The locality has to provide education, and the Government assists. This principle has been laid down over and over again. It appears with reiteration in the Report of the Duke of Newcastle's Commission of 1861; it is implicitly stated in the Acts of 1870 and 1876; it is affirmed again in the Report of the Royal Commission of last year. Clearly, therefore, increase of Grant implies increase of local subscriptions, and the demand now made by the Church of England for increased Grant without increased subscriptions would, if admitted, establish a principle hitherto unknown to English educational finance. Already this salutary principle has been far too much neglected, with the result that the subscriptions are steadily falling, and a very considerable number of elementary schools are supported by the Grant and the school fees alone. The Royal Commission obtained statistics of the schools in 155 selected districts in England and Wales. Out of the 2408 Voluntary schools in these districts, 259, or about 11 per cent., were conducted with no subscription at all. Were the limit of the Grant to be raised, as it is pretended that it should be, to 20*s.*, the certain result would be a corresponding fall in subscriptions, and an increase in the number of those schools which are maintained under private management, without any pecuniary sacrifice on the part of those in whose interest they exist.

But there is another consideration, which, simple though it is, is generally lost sight of—and that is, that the duties of the Voluntary managers are voluntary and not obligatory. It might be supposed from the tone adopted in this controversy by the supporters of Denominational schools that the Government imposed on them certain obligations and then refused to furnish the necessary means for their fulfilment. Of course the Government does nothing of the kind. It says (or should say, for unfortunately for education the Department shows a culpable leniency towards the shortcomings of

Voluntary managers): "A certain amount of school accommodation and teaching is to be provided. If you individuals like to provide it in accordance with our regulations, you shall have a Grant in aid from the Treasury; but, as a condition of our leaving under your sole control the appointment of the teacher, the management of the school, and the provision of any form of religious instruction that you may prefer, it is only right that you should make a substantial contribution to the cost in exchange for these privileges. If you do not like our terms you need not accept them, since we can set in motion the machinery provided for the purpose, and oblige the locality to do what is necessary for the education of the children." If any one is entitled to complain about increased requirements of the Code, it is the School Boards, whose duties are obligatory and not voluntary. Suppose that the Department were to make some real and substantial addition to the cost of the schools—to insist, for instance, on three times the number of teachers that they are now satisfied with. Every School Board in England would be put to considerable expense, which could by no means be avoided, but not a single Voluntary manager would suffer: he can at once close his school. And yet we do not find that the School Boards, representing as they do the wishes of the people in education, raise objections to the new provisions in the Code which are calculated to promote the efficiency of the schools. Their tendency, on the contrary, is to complain that the Department does not do enough in this direction. This was markedly the case in the discussions on the draft Code. The principal School Boards, while recognizing certain educational advances made in that document, all deplored that more was not done. It would be interesting to compare with their memorials those presented by the Voluntary managers. The few of these that are accessible to the public all complain that too much is asked, and that it is impossible to bring their schools up to the very low standard of efficiency required.

The Denominational party say: "Give us rates or an increased Grant, and we will improve our schools." It is at any rate doubtful whether they would do so; but the contention need not seriously be discussed. The conditions under which schools are left to private management is that of private support in exchange for certain privileges. It is preposterous to suppose that the privileges are to be left to them when they are at the same time exempted from contributing, and are supported from public funds.

Again, it is claimed for the Voluntary managers that they should be treated on equal terms with the School Boards, instead of being, as they are asserted to be, in a position of inferiority. But the truth is that the restrictions on the School Boards are very much more stringent than those to which Voluntary managers have to submit. For instance, Voluntary managers can open classes for technical

instruction and get a Grant in aid from the local rates, under the Act passed last Session. It is at any rate doubtful whether the School Boards may do this, and the Government refused to insert a clause to clear up the doubt and expressly confer the power. Again, the fees in a Board school have to be sanctioned by the Education Department. Voluntary managers may charge what fees they like, subject to the ninepenny limit of the Act of Parliament, and frequently use this power capriciously, to the prejudice of individual children. The School Boards, again, are subject to a rigorous audit of accounts. Voluntary managers are exempt from any such supervision, and, with a view to increase of Grant, in some cases use their freedom to make the income of their schools appear larger than it really is, by charging the teacher a rent (credited as income) and returning the amount in salary.¹ Board Schools have to be built on the basis of ten square feet of area and a hundred cubic feet of air for each child in average attendance. Voluntary schools may be overcrowded on the basis of eight square and eighty cubic feet and yet receive the Grant; and, lastly, conditions of want of ventilation, absence of playground, offensiveness of offices, bad light, and so forth, which would not be tolerated for a single day in a Board School, are permitted to go on year after year unchecked when the school is one under private management. The inspector's reports are full of complaints under these heads, and a striking instance occurred recently in London, where a Voluntary school, which had been in receipt of a Grant for years, was offered for transfer to the London School Board, and the Education Department refused to recognize it, even temporarily, as a Board School, on account of the condition of the premises.

And not only do the Voluntary managers oppose any and every proposal which would tend to improve education, not only do they demand additional public support, together with the undisturbed control over the schools to which they contribute so little, but whenever they can do so they arrogate to themselves a monopoly of education. Every proposal to form a School Board in a new district is met by the bitterest and most unscrupulous opposition on the part of the clergy, and where there is a School Board with no schools under it, as in Salisbury, clerical influence is brought to bear to prevent the Board from doing its duty in opening a Board school to meet a deficiency of accommodation. "By God's grace," said the Bishop of Salisbury, speaking at the annual meeting of the National Society on June 25 last—"By God's grace, they were determined to prevent any Board schools from entering the field;" which meant that "by God's grace" the Nonconformists of Salisbury shall be compelled to send their

¹ See, for this and other suggested modes of falsifying accounts, "Hints on Art. 114 of the New Code," by the Huddersfield and Saddleworth Church Day Schools Association, in the evidence of Mr. J. A. Brooke. Third Report of Royal Commission, p. 152.

children to Anglican schools of the most extreme type for lack of any others; and "by God's grace" a national system which, hampered and restricted as it has been in all directions, has already raised the standard of education out of the slough of neglect and inefficiency into which Voluntary management had allowed it to sink, shall be still further obstructed, and the health, intelligence, and welfare of the children shall continue to be sacrificed to the supposed interests of the Established Church, lest a clerical monopoly be endangered. The concessions made to the Church of England in 1870 have resulted in the continuance for nineteen years of a dual system of education, and Mr. Forster's expectations of the speedy spread of the School Boards until they become universal have not been realized.¹ This dual system might have been tolerated as a compromise so long as the compromise was faithfully observed, and so long as it did not retard the progress of education. But now that a deliberate attempt is being made to upset that compromise, it is time for those of us who look for progress to take the offensive, to demand that the welfare of the children shall no longer be sacrificed to any church whatever, and to lay before the country a definite educational policy on a basis of popular support and popular control.

In support of the assertion that a deliberate attempt is being made to upset the compromise of 1870, let us briefly recall the events of the past year. Lord Lingen and Sir Francis Sandford proposed schemes for transferring the duties of the School Boards to Committees of the County Councils, who should grant rate aid to all schools alike, and a clause to this effect was inserted in the Local Government Bill, but withdrawn in Committee. The objections to such a proposal are palpable, and hardly need be mentioned. Putting aside the question of rate aid, it is enough to say that the County Councils do not and cannot represent the wishes of the electors as to education. In the turmoil of a contested election, when all manner of questions of local government are being discussed, educational interests would be entirely lost sight of. A representative body, elected *ad hoc*, is absolutely essential. Look again at the legislation for technical instruction. Sir Henry Roscoe's Bill of this year, a good and useful measure, which passed the second reading, was killed by the Government in Committee because it gave power to School Boards to provide technical instruction, and only allowed the "local authority" (*i.e.*, the Town or County Council) to make such provision in the absence or default of the School Board. The Act which, by a gross abuse of the rules of the House, was forced down the throat of a depleted Parliament in the last week of the

¹ In the debate on the second reading of the Act of 1870 Mr. Forster, replying to Mr. Dixon, said, "I was glad, however, to hear my honourable friend expressing his belief that under the Bill School Boards would quickly become universal, and compulsory attendance insisted upon: because I agree with him in entertaining the hope that the effect of the Bill will be that School Boards will be established throughout the country, and that in a short time attendance at school will be rendered compulsory."

Session, is a distinct and serious blow to the School Boards. Notwithstanding the professions of complete impartiality that had been made by the Government, the Chancellor of the Exchequer confessed that if either side gained anything by the Act it was the Voluntary schools, and the whole course of the debate showed a determination to place the School Boards at a disadvantage as far as it was possible to do so. And not only is this the case, but in the Act the principle is for the first time conceded that authorities other than School Boards may levy a rate for the purposes of education, even in School Board districts, and that this rate may be given to institutions under private management. It is true that there is a clause in the Act providing that the rating authorities shall be represented on the governing body of the institutions receiving rate aid, but its terms are such that it is absolutely worthless. Under no circumstances short of a subsidy from the rates, exceeding in amount the fees, subscriptions, and all other income of the school (Parliamentary Grant excepted), can the rating authority have any real voice in the management. The Romanist press, it may be noted, hailed the passing of the Act with joy, as the beginning of the end of the School Board system, and the organ of the National Society is rejoicing that the School Boards "are not to have everything their own way." Lastly, reference may be made to the Report of the Royal Commission, which declared that "the time has come for a new departure."

The time has, indeed, come for a new departure. The principle of local self-government, long an article of the Liberal creed, has even been accepted by the Tories as an inevitable though unwelcome necessity. No one, therefore, can fairly argue that the education of the people, one of the most, if not quite the most, important duty that the nation has to discharge, should any longer be left in the hands of a body of irresponsible persons, animated for the most part by strong sectarian prejudices and a hatred of popular institutions. It must be entrusted to the people themselves, acting through their chosen representatives; and the only question now for consideration is what should be the general lines of the Liberal educational programme.

Mr. MacCarthy, who read a paper on Free Education at the Church Congress last month, made some suggestions for legislation which deserve careful consideration. His scheme is as follows: (1) School Boards to be universal, with a unit of area sufficiently large to ensure efficient local administration. (2) Voluntary schools to be transferred to School Boards for the hours of secular instruction (except under circumstances to be named), leaving religious instruction in the hands of present managers. (3) Either a Board school or a Voluntary school transferred as above to be within reach of every child. (4) Such schools to be free of any payment on the part of the parents for fees or books. (5) A fixed grant of, say, 12s. 6d. per child in average attendance to be paid out of the

Imperial Exchequer as a free education grant. (6) A Voluntary school, with the consent of the Education Department, need not be transferred to the School Board for secular hours and may charge fees, provided a Board school or Voluntary school transferred as above is within reach of every child desiring such a school.

There is no doubt as to the desirability of the first of these proposals. Scotland has had universal School Boards for the last seventeen years, and there is no reason whatever why the same machinery for education should not be provided in England without further delay. And, still following the precedent of Scotland, the School Boards in England and Wales should receive some considerable extension of power. The English Boards are limited to providing elementary education; the auditors have in some cases surcharged, or threatened to surcharge, money spent on manual instruction; and although an eminent Counsel has given it as his opinion that such expenditure may lawfully be incurred, the question has not yet been authoritatively settled. In Scotland the Boards can not only give manual instruction to the children in the elementary schools, but they can also provide and maintain institutions for the higher branches of technical training, and have considerable powers in the direction of higher education generally. Some of the Scotch high schools are expressly placed under the School Boards. It is necessary that similar power be conferred on the English Boards, since, in the words of the resolution, of which Mr. Acland gave notice last Session, "It is only by the universal establishment of School Boards throughout England and Wales, with areas of adequate size under their control, that this country can hope to obtain in a thoroughly satisfactory form for the more intelligent children of the working classes that higher elementary education, general and technical, which is so essential for their welfare, and so vital for the progress of the United Kingdom in its commercial and industrial interests." The question of area is more difficult. In the rural districts the present parochial area is too small for efficiency. Many of the school districts have only a population of two or three hundred, the rating value is low, and the rates in consequence are very high—frequently as much as 1s. 3d. or 1s. 6d. On the other hand, the administrative county is too large. A county School Board could not have the full and detailed local knowledge which is essential to efficient working, and some intermediate area, such as that of the proposed District Councils, would probably be the best; or Parochial Boards might be formed for the purposes of school management only, and delegates from these Boards might constitute a County Education Board for rating and general supervision. But whatever machinery may be created should combine large rating areas, with a considerable amount of local management.

Mr. MacCarthy's next proposals are open to criticism. He sug-

gests that the Voluntary schools should be transferred to the Boards for purposes of secular instruction, leaving the religious teaching in the hands of the present managers, and that a Board school or a transferred Voluntary school should be within reach of every child. The objections to this scheme are—First, that the Voluntary managers would not consent to transfer their schools, and to compel them to do so would intensify and give permanence to their hatred of the popular system. And as, *ex-hypothesi*, two sets of teachers, those of the Board and those of the private managers, would be teaching the same children, considerable friction would almost certainly result. Secondly, supposing that satisfactory terms of transfer could be arranged, we should not by this means secure over a great part of England what is urgently needed—namely, elementary schools where the religious instruction is of an unsectarian character. This has been demanded by all the great Nonconformist bodies, notably by the Wesleyans, whose Conference passed the following resolution on the subject in 1873 :—

“ The Conference adopts the Report of the Special Committee on Primary Education appointed by the last Conference. In adopting this Report the Conference expresses its regret that the essential parts of the recommendations of the Committee have not been adopted by the Government in their measure for the amendment of the Elementary Education Act of 1870, and records its deliberate conviction that in justice to the interests of national education in the broadest sense, and to the different religious denominations of the country, School Boards should be established everywhere, and an undenominational school placed within reasonable distance of every family.”

In the Minority Report of the Royal Commission, which might be called the charter of the Liberal party in education, this demand of the Wesleyan Conference is approved and adopted; and, indeed, any reform of education which did not secure the universal accessibility of unsectarian schools would be obviously incomplete and imperfect. A wholesale transfer of Voluntary schools under the conditions suggested by Mr. MacCarthy would apparently result in the establishment and perpetuation of denominational teaching with all the bitterness and ill-feeling which it necessarily involves.

The next points in Mr. MacCarthy's scheme are that all Board schools and transferred Voluntary schools should be open free of any charge, and that a Parliamentary Grant of 12s. 6d. a head should be paid in lieu of fees. Free education must, of course, be included in any programme of educational reform. It has been in the air for some time, but the demand for it has been enormously strengthened and accelerated by the Scotch Local Government Act of this year, which gave a Grant of a certain amount to the Scotch School Boards in lieu of fees. Mr. MacCarthy is, of course, perfectly right in saying that the free education Grant should only be paid to schools under popular control; but the amount of the Grant proposed by him is unnecessarily high. The average fees now charged are—

Church of England Schools	10s. 6d. per annum.
Wesleyan	15s. 11d. „
Roman Catholic	9s. 2½d. „
British	13s. 1½d. „
Board	8s. 11d. „

or an average for the whole of 10s. 3d. Twelve and sixpence a head is thus a higher average fee than is charged in any except the Wesleyan and British schools, which are only educating 392,000 children against 3,256,000 in the Board Schools, and in those of the English and Roman churches. Seeing, moreover, that with the creation of universal School Boards a considerable number of British and Wesleyan schools would probably be closed, a Grant in lieu of fees of 10s. or 10s. 6d. per head should be ample.

To Mr. MacCarthy's last suggestion, that Voluntary schools may, with the consent of the Education Department, continue to receive a Grant and charge a fee, if there is a free school within equally easy reach of the children attending such school, no objection need be offered. Those parents who prefer that their children should be educated in a denominational school—the Roman Catholics, for instance—should undoubtedly be allowed to exercise their choice, if their co-religionists like to provide schools for them; but it should be a *sine qua non* that the managers of such schools bear some substantial share of the burden of the cost in subscription as a condition of continuing to receive the Parliamentary Grant, and that they should be placed under the same obligations of audit and publicity as the School Boards. Schools under private management, supported by the Grant and the fees alone, should no longer be permitted. Furthermore, such schools must be subjected to the same structural regulations as the Board Schools, and health and decency must not continue to be sacrificed to the pockets of the managers.

In the face of the daily increasing pretensions of the advocates of a system of sectarian education under popular management, it is urgently necessary that Liberals should make up their minds upon the education question, and formulate their demands. Any scheme of educational reform, whatever else it may contain, should include these points at least.

1. Universal School Boards of suitable area.
2. A considerable extension of the existing powers of the School Boards.
3. Free Education under popular control.
4. Unsectarian schools within reasonable reach of all children.

For all these points we have a precedent in Scotland, and there need be no difficulty about extending to England and Wales the privileges that Scotland already enjoys. At present the Liberal party has no definite educational policy; at best it is a policy of *status quo*, and resistance to encroachment—a weak, and therefore a dangerous attitude. The want of a policy has already led to one

disaster to the Technical Instruction Act of this year; it may lead to many more. That Act was supported by a certain number of Liberals whose educational orthodoxy is usually beyond reproach. They were anxious for some measure of technical education, and disheartened as they were by previous abortive attempts at legislation, they accepted the Government Bill *faute de mieux*, without apparently any perception of the dangers accompanying it. Had there been before the country a comprehensive educational programme, these gentlemen would probably have been willing to wait until the day arrives when Liberal principles shall once more assert themselves, and would not, in their laudable eagerness for the advancement of technical instruction, have assisted to strike the most severe blow at popular education that it has yet received. Everything goes to show that this Act is but the thin end of the wedge, and that the present Government, if time permits, will bring in further and more reactionary measures, and by crippling or destroying the School Boards, will establish denominational education with the aid of public money, and set the clock back fifty years. Let us therefore take warning by the past. Let our leaders draw up a definite scheme and lay it before the country for acceptance, and let them offer the most uncompromising opposition to any proposals of the present Government which do not square with the Liberal policy. We may have to wait a few years before we can secure the necessary reforms; but it is better to go on as we can meanwhile, and to take care that our reforms, when we do make them, are thorough and lasting, than to hasten them unduly, and so have them partial and incomplete.

THE PROGRESS OF AGRICULTURE AND THE DECLINE OF SMALL FARMING.

BOTH in England and on the Continent, in the eighteenth century, the obstacles opposed to improved husbandry were presented by what remained of the ancient manorial system. These obstacles varied greatly in nature and degree in different countries and localities, varying from the fetters which surrounded the serfs of Prussia and Poland to the tithes which vexed the yeomen of Kent. In England they were, perhaps, less disastrous and obstinate than anywhere else, and were to be found rather in the slovenly habits acquired under the old agrarian regime than in any actual difficulties which could not be overcome by intelligence and legal assistance. "There doth not seem," said Jethro Tull, the author of *Modern Tillage*, "to be more prejudice (especially among the vulgar) in matters of religion than of agriculture. In both, the question is not whether a different religion or a different agriculture is most reasonable, but only whether it be different." In all settled communities the accepted scheme of husbandry has ever been as much a bond prescribed by authority for holding men together as religion itself; and while the rise and fall of creeds may in many cases be traced with distinctness, the changes in agricultural usage have been so gradual that historical inquiry is lost in uncertainty when it is attempted to ascertain any absolute commencement or cardinal reform in the system which in Tull's time was still strongly operative, and at the present day is recognizable in every country side. For the inventor of the drill husbandry had not only to lament perverse opposition; he had also to recognize that the conditions of the traditional system were inconsistent with any considerable improvement. Yet, as in religion dogmas and rubrics have given way to sweet reasonableness, so in agriculture the canons and ritual of the old manorial regime have disappeared till the cultivation of the earth's surface has become an affair of science and legislative reform.

Tull advocated his innovations about 1731. Though English husbandry had already made some notable acquisitions, his experiments serve well to mark the beginning of an agricultural advance which was to achieve a revolution in rural industry. When Tull wrote, clover, turnips, sainfoin, and lucerne were known and cultivated in a

few confined districts; and his own particular contributions were drilling by machines, and tilling between the rows by horse-hoes. But it is because his manner of approaching questions of culture was so reasoned, that it would be unjust to date the advance from any other event than the publication of his writings. Ninety years afterwards, Cobbett, in publishing a new edition of *The Horse-Hoeing Husbandry*, wrote: "I was born and bred amongst affairs of gardening and farming. I had read a great deal, too, about them; but till I read Tull I knew nothing of the principles. But what struck me most forcibly, when I came to read Tull, was, that all I had read before, that had anything like principle in it, had been stolen from him."

Tull was not a farmer by breeding, nor were his improvements due to any natural inclination towards agriculture. He began life as a lawyer, and was compelled by ill-health to abandon his profession. But he was under the necessity of taking into his own hands a farm which bad tenants had greatly injured; and it was in the endeavour to overcome his physical disadvantages that he initiated the neat and assiduous tillage of modern husbandry. Drilling in his time was no novel term; for when farmers used to sow their beans and peas in channels or furrows made by hand, they called the operation drilling. Tull, as he, himself, tells us, adopted the method for planting sainfoin only because the seed was scarce and dear, and he wished to plant his whole farm with it; because farm servants were then beginning "to exalt their dominion over their masters." He only invented a machine for executing the operation because he found that his labourers were unwilling to carry out his directions. The machine itself was principally derived from the sounding board of an organ, with which instrument Tull's musical tastes had rendered him familiar. The first hints of the horse-hoeing culture he took from the ploughed vineyards near Frontignan and Cette in Languedoc.

The cardinal principle of Tull's system is that roots extend both outwards and downwards much further than is generally suspected. Roots, in his quaint phrase, are as inverted guts; and it should be the object of the farmer to get them enveloped with the most finely broken pabulum possible. But they are peculiar in that they extend themselves while assimilating nourishment. Hence sowing should be executed in rows, and tillage applied not only before planting, but at different stages of growth, so that the spontaneous cohesion of the soil may be prevented from arresting the ramification of the rootlets. Hoeing with Tull had little in common with the surface-scratching of the old-fashioned, or Virgilian, husbandry, as he calls it. Extirpating weeds is but a subordinate result of his process. Pulverizing the soil to the bottom of the staple is the first end which his culture has in view; and to keep it friable at that distance from the plants which best suits their roots at any given period of their growth is the principal object to which his hoeing is

directed. If this be done competently, he assures the farmer that manure and fallows need enter very slightly into his expenditure.

It is here unnecessary to follow Tull's instructions and observations for the purpose of separating the sound part of his precepts from the fanciful and erroneous portion. His mistakes could do little harm. His dislike of manure, for example, was as innocuous as his dread of toads. And the exaggerated form which his doctrine took—the breadth of his rows and the width of his intervals far exceeding what was normally advantageous in our climate—misled only a few experimentalists. If to this day neither drilling machines nor horse-hoes, nor deep-working ploughs, cultivators or scarifiers, broke and ameliorated English soil, Tull's influence on agriculture would yet have been of the first order. It was his polemic against the slothful traditions of the orthodox husbandry that achieved what was most wanted in his time to give new life to our rural economy. Tull's attempts at mechanical precision only attained their full influence in succeeding generations, notwithstanding the many recorded instances of enlightened agriculturists proceeding in their researches by testing his explicit directions. His refutation of what he called the *sat erit* doctrine was absolutely necessary to make possible the great agricultural advance which occurred during the rest of the century.

Virgil had written in the first Georgic :

“At si non fuerit Tellus fecunda, sub ipsum
Arcturum tenui sat erit suspendere sulco.”

“None of the improvements,” says Tull, “made on any sort of arable land by foreign grasses or turnips could have been introduced into Britain without renouncing the *sat erit* doctrine of Virgil; for they will not succeed on any sort of land without pulverization by tillage; and they are most generally made on light land, and therefore may be properly called anti-Virgilian.” Nor was connection of classical precept with slovenly usage arbitrary, or merely deprecatory of the habit which in those days caused writers on agriculture with any pretensions to learning to eke out their practical knowledge by scholastic references. There was a real relation between the Georgics and those errors in practice and theory which inverted the true value of soils, encouraged laziness and ignorance, and involved Tull himself in an ungraceful polemic with rancorous obscurantists.

In Tull's time it was said, with much appearance of truth, that in England Virgil's husbandry was more practised than in Italy. Latin words, it was pointed out, still survived among shepherds and ploughmen in those districts which had long been occupied by the Romans. It is probable, indeed, that the conventional three-fold rotation was imported into this country by them, though the agrarian system to which it was fitted is supposed to have been of

earlier origin both in Britain and elsewhere. At any rate, as soon as we obtain any information on English farming we find the manorial regime and three-field culture soundly established, and inextricably connected with one another. It was, therefore, against the heritage of centuries that the new husbandry had to contend. It was against the slovenly habits and positive rules of an outworn rural economy that diligent and accurate farming had first to make its way. Hence agricultural progress, when once inaugurated, was most rapid in districts which had hitherto been almost uncultivated. The famous advance of Northumberland entirely owed its extraordinary directness to the desolation which had been caused by Border frays and moss-troopers. Other instances are to be found in the former wastes of Norfolk and Lincolnshire.

In the eighteenth century much land still lay in the arrangement that had been handed down from the time when every manor possessed a secluded polity of its own, and every denizen occupied a fixed place in its economy. The quantity of land thus situated can never be exactly determined. It had been reduced by earlier enclosures, as we know from many authorities; but when agriculture began to make its great and rapid advance—that is, about 1760—there must still have been an enormous breadth of arable land lying in open fields, and of pasture lying either as waste or as common grazing ground. The Enclosure Bills passed subsequently to that date prove the existence of a great acreage, but it is clear from other records of the time that it was not unusual for land to be enclosed without application for Parliamentary powers. Hence it is probable that in the eighteenth century even yet more English land retained the aspect of the middle ages than historians have felt justified in inferring from the statistics of Private Bill legislation.

Now, the legal customs pertaining to the old system excluded the practice of nearly all the improved husbandry. The open arable land of a parish was disposed in three separate fields, each of which was devoted to one stage of the threefold course. There was the field under fallow, the field under wheat, and the field under beans or barley. Hence the highest value was set on strong soils—that is, the heavy clays which later were distinguished as bean land from the soils suitable to the turnip culture. Scanty manure, perfunctory tillage and frequent grain crops and fallows, gave the heavy land a great advantage over the lighter and more manageable soils; and the prejudice in its favour endured after the improved husbandry had been introduced, insomuch that instances occurred where the Commissioners under an Enclosure Act inverted in their award the real value of the land under their dispensation to an extent which in a few years amounted to a serious injustice.

No part of Tull's writings is more ably conceived, or more in advance of his time, than his scornful repudiation of *sat erit* tillage, *si non fuerit Tellus fecunda*, for what was reckoned in his time as poor land was the very medium by which modern husbandry was about to achieve its greatest successes.

But, what was worse, the land lay in strips, divided only by grass balks; and a farmer would hold some, not only in all the fields, but in different parts of each field. Thus every one had to carry on his farming in fractions surrounded by fractions belonging to other people. The consequence was that if a man took the trouble to free his land from weeds he ran a great risk of having it thickly sown with weeds from neighbouring ill-kept strips, for there were no remedies against the growers of seed-weeds such as obtain in any well-managed allotment club. If he had a mind to drain it, he seldom had the chance of carrying the water away, because somebody's land would lie in the course of the fall: if he wished to cross-plough a strip, he could not turn his plough without trespassing on his neighbour's land: if he thought of planting any novel crop, he was subject to the ravages of the sheep and cattle of the parish, which after harvest were driven on to the stubble of the common fields: if he were ambitious enough to desire to utilize the fallow year for some green crop by diligent tillage, he encountered the insuperable difficulty that the rest of the field abounded with weeds and couch grass on which the live stock of the parish again roamed at large.

The influence of the common grazing grounds was similarly inimical to superior stock-keeping. The uniformity of type which characterized the animals in any particular locality before the epoch of scientific breeding, simply expressed how promiscuous breeding had kept stock down to one dead-level of inferiority, notwithstanding any excellency which the special circumstances of a district might have developed. In fact, stock-keeping under the ancient system was not recognized as a matter of individual enterprise. Manorial custom often imposed on certain persons, usually the parson, the duty of finding the parish bull or boar; restrictions were also often judiciously placed on turning bulls and stallions on the common runs, which with the scarcity of clover helped to render experimental breeding a matter of indifference to the ordinary farmer. Hence, while the stock of a district was produced under identical conditions, the most uninformed prejudices were created among breeders respecting what it was desirable to produce for the grazier and butcher. The belief that a beast should afford an extensive bony scaffold to be covered by subsequent fattening long survived the adoption of a more enlightened ideal by advanced breeders.

The low standard fell, too, much lower than mere want of selection could depress it. Under the common system of managing pasture

and arable land, feed was always of poor quality save on a few favoured spots at certain times of the year; and it was always very insufficient in winter through want of roots. Very frequently right of common was unlimited, and every owner, in endeavouring to make the most of his right, starved both his own and his neighbour's cattle. When the common was stinted, as it was called, the ratio of heads per right was too often calculated on the basis of its produce at the best time of year and the requirements of very small animals, insomuch that commoners would sometimes agree to abstain from putting on the full number of stock. The inconvenience of having no winter roots can now with difficulty be conceived. Yet it was endured in some parts of the country till very recent times. About 1817 Mr. Adam Murray, an East Mid-Lothian farmer, came into Cardiganshire to set an example to Lord Lisburn's tenantry; and he told the Select Committee on Agriculture in 1833 that the natives of the place had no fresh mutton or beef in winter till he taught them to grow green crops. In fact, there was only one evil required to complete the full measure of disadvantages under which stock-keeping laboured in the olden time. This was the prevalence of disease; and this was an evil in which the traditional system seems to have pre-eminently abounded. Poor living would account for much mortality. It was found that keeping sheep well-fed in autumn on seeds and turnips greatly reduced the losses from red-water or braxy. But the tracts of waste land generally contained some unhealthy spots, and in these the half-starved beasts contracted various maladies, some of which, being contagious, were immediately communicated to the stock of the whole country side. The best thing that can be said of the old stock-keeping system is that under its reign certain pronounced types were developed from which the modern scientific breeder could draw the elements he required; and that through the survival of the fittest these strains had grown extremely hardy.

Happily the tyranny of legal custom was susceptible of direct attack. It was otherwise with the habits which ancient usage had engendered. Rural labourers are sagacious enough with regard to matters with which they have been familiar for generations; and so far they deserve the compliments passed on their intelligence by Adam Smith. But for this very reason they are peculiarly inaccessible to new ideas. Their sagacity is in direct ratio to the antiquity of their practice; and so is their inability to appreciate methods opposed to traditional usage. Cleaning land had been very perfunctorily performed hitherto: the advent of a more rational system of landholding found the agriculturist in no mood to hoe more than his forefathers had done. Turnip-hoeing, indeed, was long in many districts feasible only by hiring itinerant skilled labourers. Foul fallows had been inevitable in open common fields: when the land

had been laid together in severalty and enclosed, Hodge could still see no reason why he should trouble himself with fallow crops. Stunted animals and a high rate of mortality had from time immemorial attended stock-keeping; when the causes of these drawbacks were removed, and an Enclosure Bill had relieved the parson from finding him a bull or boar, he was not disposed to lavish the care and intelligence required by high-bred stock, but preferred to boast of the hardiness of what he had come by fortuitously. Under the old system homesteads and dung-yards were very imperfectly developed: when farms were consolidated, and the stock-yard became the centre of their economy, farmers were slow to understand that they must rent suitable buildings from their landlords, and conduct their business with scrupulous regard for the production of meat and manure.

The oddest remnant of the old times obstinately persisted in the constitution of the modern plough teams. Ploughing was treated, not as a task to be performed in the manner most efficient under the circumstances at the smallest possible cost, but as a kind of function which could only be worthily performed by a canonical number of horses or oxen, and with the officiation of a certain number of attendants. Arthur Young, in his *Northern Tour* (1768), concluded, from what he saw of the ordinary plough teams, that "the whole economy of tillage was quite a matter of chance;" and Sir James Caird, in his *Survey of English Agriculture* (1850), found much cause for wonder on the same account. But the truth is that the rustic mind long remained—indeed, it still to some degree remains—under the spell of manorial authority, when the whole organization of the rural community was centred in the great plough-team of the lord, which was constituted, not so much with regard to depth of furrow and consistency of soil, as to the discipline of feudal dependants by general, and therefore arbitrary, rules.¹

As the eighteenth century wore on, the more active husbandry, which the new fallow crops demanded and the experimentalists recommended, attacked the common fields and wastes with continually increasing rigour. The assault was conducted principally by the nobility and county gentry. It is a curious historical coincidence that extraneous circumstances had interested proprietors in the improvement of their estates in time to sustain with agricultural produce that manufacturing expansion which ultimately enabled England to establish its industrial supremacy while the rest of Europe was being overrun by armies. While the common farmers, as Young testifies, were still immovably attached to the old routine,

¹ The horse-power anomaly survived among advanced agriculturists. In 1840 Mr. Pusey told of a Suffolk farmers' club, whose members, living within five miles of the place of meeting, using the same kind of horse, and cultivating the same kind of land, found that the cost of maintaining their teams differed by fifty per cent. both per head and per acre.

and regarded inquiries into their practices as pertinent only for the purposes of taxation, country gentlemen were energetically making experiments, keeping accounts, seeking and affording information, and pushing forward schemes of enclosing, draining, and road-making.

Probably Professor Thorold Rogers is right in his persuasion that "English landowners set the fashion of making the best of agriculture because they desired to make one wealth-producing agency become a rival in personal interest and in popular sympathy with another." It is certain that, for the first time in English rural history, money became the supreme object of landed proprietors. At all times landlords have been eager to obtain the disposal of the greatest possible surplus of produce from their land. In earlier times this surplus took the form of men, of menials and warriors; and the legitimate avarice of the lords did not inevitably betray them into a policy at variance with the claims of those whose labour alone gave value to the soil. But with the advance of social order and material civilization, proprietors found less delight in the multitude of their henchmen, and more attraction in the luxuries which the surplus produce of their lands could procure. These luxuries were, of course, produced by men; but they were produced most advantageously by men thickly congregated in towns, and they passed to the landlords through the medium of money. As long as the common-field system endured, money rents were payable by small cultivators as easily as by larger farmers. Landlords had no reason to think of money to the exclusion of their tenants, except when they yielded to the prospects of sheep-farming. But when the *sat erit* principle was abandoned, capital rather than men was sought as an occupier, and it became profitable to reduce the number of those who lived in comfort on the soil.

The most pressing reform called for by the old system was to lay the scattered possessions of each owner into severalty or single parcels, to fence these lots, and to abolish the common right of grazing on the stubble. The inconvenience of disconnected strips was so glaring, that in many cases proprietors had made exchanges, or had annexed adjoining lots by purchase; and often some variation in the established routine would be introduced by common agreement, a proceeding sometimes termed "hitching a fallow." When the readjustment of properties had been brought about, either under Parliamentary commissions or by mutual agreement, it was found that the whole economy of land tenure had been changed. As long as the land lay in disconnected strips, and husbandry was still rude, there was no reason to deter owners from letting it in small quantities to men of small means. Indeed, under such circumstances several tenants could pay a higher aggregate rent for the use of an estate than could a single large farmer, because they were willing to live more thriftily and to do more work with their own hands than a man

who had capital enough at his command to engage in any other industrial career. The question of homesteads did not then form an important factor in the problem. The houses of the farmers did not necessarily belong to the farms, and they might be at some distance from the common fields without being farther from them than was one fragment of a holding from a fellow fragment. In common-field parishes the houses of the farmers were usually collected together in a village, which offered some conveniences of its own without losing any that might belong to a homestead, such as was possible under the existing conditions, or useful under the backward system of agriculture. Thus it has come about that at the present day it is common to see large tracts of fertile land which are known to have been under cultivation for many centuries, possessed of no farm-houses more ancient than the Enclosure Acts of less than a hundred years ago, while some neighbouring old high road will be lined for some distance with buildings of respectable antiquity.

In a great measure what was true of this order, with regard to small holdings, was true of small estates. The land being already in fragments, the small buyer could obtain what he wanted if he could pay a slightly higher proportional price for it. And in those days it had not yet come about that he who seeks landed property for pleasure and social influence is able to outbid him who needs it to live by. On the contrary, it was generally affirmed that no one could afford to pay so much for land as he who entered it as an industrious proprietor.

But as soon as estates were readjusted and consolidated, the advantage on the side of the small holder and occupying proprietor was transferred to the side of the large farmers and estates. Homesteads had to be built in convenient situations; and the larger the holding the less the expense per acre. The new husbandry, with its assiduous tillage, fallow crops, winter feeding of stock, extensive use of manure, and storage of large quantities of grain, needing stock and dung yards, elaborate implements, and capacious barns¹—in short, all the consequences of abandoning the *sat erit* principle in corn and meat farming, now the sole objects of English agriculture—made the capitalist master of our rural economy. A proprietor obtained a higher interest on his outlay, with less trouble of collection, by acquiring large farms and letting them to substantial tenants. A tenant obtained a higher rate of profit by taking a holding large enough to employ all his attention, implements, live stock, and credit. An agent (for now agents attained considerable influence when their principals congregated in the towns or fought in the wars) best secured his own ease by abbreviating his rent-roll and simplifying his distrains.

¹ When there were no steam-threshing machines it was impossible to keep grain locked up in stacks till it was time to send it to market.

It is now too late in the day to question the means employed to bring the wastes and commons under good husbandry; but there can be little doubt that very frequently the interests of the poorer classes were greatly neglected, though in this respect the later enclosures compared very favourably with the earlier ones. For there were in the ancient system facilities for distributing pasture in small quantities which only real solicitude for the welfare of the small cultivators could have retained under the new regime. Rights of common were often the property of a few owners, but they could be let to many renters, and thus they formed a counterpart to the strips in the open fields. When enclosure took place, the proprietors received parcels of land in compensation, which they fenced and treated as single holdings; to the ruin of their former tenants. When rights of common were attached to particular tenements, it rarely happened that an enclosure apportioned to each house a piece of land in convenient contiguity. The rights ceased, and the indemnity went to form some new estate for the freeholder of the dwellings, the tenants of which had to give up stock-keeping. Where right of common was unrestricted, the commoners seem to have been dropped out of account altogether in the greater number of enclosures. Encroachments on the wastes were treated with varying toleration, being extinguished by some Bills if they had endured less than twenty years, by others if they had existed less than sixty years. And when the small claimant did receive some consideration in an enclosure, it too often happened that his plot of ground was so inconveniently situated that he was glad to escape the expense of paying his share of the legal costs, and of fencing his allotment, by selling it at a low price to some substantial neighbour.

One reason why small pastoral husbandry fared hardly better than small arable farming, is to be found in the coincidence that at that time the incipient factory system was denuding the country of those numerous families who united with some manufacture the practice of agriculture on a small scale. When the cottage manufacturers had been converted into the hirelings of the town capitalist, the time was not far off when the cultivator of the soil was to become the stipendiary of the poor rates. With the help of cottage industry, small husbandry might have held out long enough to establish a place for itself in the new order. But left alone to the tender consideration of Enclosure Acts, and landlords, and their agents, it silently and suddenly yielded its position as an English institution, and survived for a time only in certain secluded districts or by the indulgence of some humane squire.

When Arthur Young made his tours he gathered all available particulars respecting the expenses and produce of cows. After tabulating the details, he had to confess that it was extremely mysterious, but that he could not possibly discover wherein lay the

profit of dairying. According to his wont, he forthwith offered suggestions for making the business more profitable. But the fact was, as the cowkeepers themselves told him, that cows were kept because they consumed what would otherwise be useless. At that time cow-keeping, except about the towns, was on the same basis that poultry-keeping and pig-feeding are now. It was a by-industry, conducted by unmarketable labour on land which bore a very small value: and the prices got by this practice were too low to show a profit if the expenses were reckoned in terms of saleable labour and rack-rented land. In those days a cow was as common an adjunct to the cottage and small house as is now a clutch of chicken. It was kept on land which paid hardly more than prairie rent; it was tended by members of the family who could earn no wages, or by wage-earners when their day's work was over. When wastes and commons, grazing rights and fallow stubbles, still remained, it was literally true that cows were generally kept to consume what would otherwise be lost.

It is unnecessary to dwell on the rural system in which cow-keeping assumed the comfortable aspect of a by-industry. That order departed for ever along with the wastes and common fields. But the new dispensation, introduced though it was by an unprecedented advance of agriculture, brought difficulties of its own which have remained the reproach, and to this day threaten to be the ruin, of English farming. The immediate moral and economical result of the change may be inferred from the following remark concerning Yardly-Goben in Northamptonshire, which is chosen at random from among the parochial reports collected by Sir Frederic Eden at the close of the last century:—"Before the enclosure took place (nineteen years ago) farms were from £10 to £40 a year, and any person could then rent a small tenement: but now, the parish being mostly thrown into large farms, it requires a very considerable capital to stock one. This circumstance reduces numbers to the necessity of living in a state of servile dependence on the large farmers; and as they have no prospect to which their hopes can reasonably look forward, their industry is checked; economy is deprived of its greatest stimulative, and their only thought is to enjoy the present moment."

It is now the fashion to reprobate the enclosure of waste and common land as the principal cause of the disappearance of the small cultivator. But in point of fact, the more carefully contemporary reports are studied, the more clearly does it appear that the reclamation and partition of the commons was in itself favourable to the small farmer if he were only accepted as a tenant at all. Wherever commons were enclosed with strict regard to the interests immediately involved, the small cultivator gained much by the step. Scattered through the records of the time may be found a multitude

of instances where the small men cheerfully paid an increased rent for land when it was enclosed, and gained therefrom a much greater profit than they could from their share of open common.* And if the agricultural problem of the day had been to enable as many peasantry as possible to supply themselves with milk, pork, potatoes and coarse bread, and to make moderate purchases from the towns, they would all have secured advantages from the new situation. Unfortunately, however, the agricultural problem was how to obtain for the towns the greatest net produce of corn and meat. So the land was cleared of all superfluous inhabitants, and the husbandmen who remained were degraded into hinds, and condemned to a sordid existence.

The long-standing dispute between the advocates of large and small holdings seems to be now resolved into its true elements of contention. The points at issue are no longer concerned with the absolutely best system of agriculture. They are now seen to be rather questions relative to markets and labourers. When our manufacturing system was rapidly expanding, offering employment to the surplus rural population, and demanding increasing quantities of home-grown corn and meat, large farms were necessarily most lucrative. That this conclusion was accepted by proprietors, with too little consideration for the peasantry, must certainly be admitted. But justice demands that in reflecting on their conduct it should always be remembered that enclosing was most active when the success of capital and disciplined organization was first becoming patent to the world. It is, indeed, evident that landlords trusted that their policy of consolidation would be attended by greater and more constant plenty for society in general, even if it disestablished many a thrifty independent individual, or drove some of their peasantry to recruit the population of the towns. This view was the more plausible since, in spite of their efforts, war and bad seasons were at that time frequently inflicting the pangs of starvation on the lower classes.

Yet it is now plain that Wesley and Coleridge protested for a good cause when they remonstrated in favour of the small cultivator. There is no change more observable in the agricultural literature of the period than the growth of solicitude for small husbandry which manifested itself as the country became more completely enclosed. It was as regular in appearing after a district had been thrown into severalty, as were lamentations at the discovery that after a time land grew sick of clover. The horrifying rise of the poor rates alone compelled attention to the difficulty, and induced practical men to advocate the formation of a certain number of small holdings, and the accommodation of the labourers with field-gardens. Cobbett, in 1826, noticed that granting allotments at a high rent was coming into vogue, and added, "it is a little step towards a-coming back to

the ancient small life and leaseholds and common-fields." The little step has certainly done something to add interest to the hopeless lives of those whose forefathers always had a chance of attaining to an independent position: by help of recent legislation it may complete this work, and even advance to vary the monotony of those crafts which once were rarely denied all participation in the benefits of rural industry; but as yet it has done nothing to restore a system which was suppressed, not through its own incapacity for improvement, but by force of extraneous circumstances.

Now that the net produce of meat and wheat is of very inferior consideration to the maintenance of a contented peasantry, the prevention of overcrowding in the towns, and the production of dairy goods, poultry, fruit, and vegetables, the question of agricultural holdings requires restatement, and will require a different solution. English agriculture no longer possesses a secluded market for corn or meat. The home cultivator has now to compete with the farmers of every soil and clime with no other set-off against the inconstancy of the weather and the weight of taxation than proximity to his customers, accurate acquaintance with their tastes, and the use of a stock of animals and plants which are superior in desired qualities to the productions of any other country. A century ago landlords doubled or trebled their rents, and farmers made fortunes, by adopting a new system of landholding and cultivation. The conditions having changed, it is to be presumed that yet another readjustment is required. On the former occasion progress principally consisted in overcoming the indolent habits of the past. Perhaps in the present case it awaits the abandonment of an analogous adherence to traditional usage. *Sat erit*, to revert to Tull's animadversions, may exist in many forms. It may mean carelessness in studying the wants of the market: it may mean disinclination to convert farms designed for growing what all the world can grow more cheaply into holdings suitable for producing what cannot be obtained from abroad of first-rate quality: it may mean indifference as to whether the labourers are left to plod along as boorish clowns, or encouraged to raise themselves into an active and intelligent peasantry. In short, the expression of Virgil's which excited Tull's disapproval may veil enough rule-of-thumb practice to disqualify a nation's agriculture from successfully competing in its own markets, and to hinder the adjustment of the most ancient and reputable of businesses to the most novel and dubious of economical conditions. Is British farming suffering from obscurantism of this sort?

The question needs only to be asked to be answered in the affirmative. English agriculture is depressed because under entirely new conditions landlords and farmers continue to make shift with the same system that was developed for them by their fathers in the latter half of the last century. It is suffering

because neither culture nor holdings are adapted to the growth of that produce which will yield a return on its freshness and quality. It is being hindered from starting in the right direction, because proprietors, tenants, and labourers are too little versatile, to readily adopt the small mixed husbandry, which needs deft and assiduous attention, with a keen observation of the markets. Fruit-growing, poultry-keeping, dairying, market-gardening, and bee-keeping, with their attendant processes of packing and retailing, require more personal care than capital can at present command from hired labour. They are likely, therefore, to become the business of a new race of peasant families, relieved from the routine of combing, carding, spinning, and weaving that hampered their fore-runners. The further progress of agriculture will surely atone for the wrong that its great advance did to small farming.

But the balance will not be redeemed without tedious delay and hardship. Present tenants will not surrender their holdings till their capital has been greatly diminished; landlords will not make efforts to reorganize their estates till successive reductions of rent have made all effort extremely difficult. The skill, care, and industry required by small husbandry will not at once be forthcoming from a peasantry bred under a century's depression. It is only because history so clearly indicates how their demoralization was brought about that any confidence can be felt in the gradual extinction of bad influences, and the eventual re-establishment of English agriculture on a sound basis of individual thrift and intelligence.

INDEPENDENT SECTION.

[Under the above title a limited portion of THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW is occasionally set apart for the reception of able Articles, which, though harmonizing with the general spirit and aims of the Review, may contain opinions at variance with the particular ideas or measures it advocates. The object of the Editors in introducing this department is to facilitate the expression of opinion by writers of high mental power and culture, who, while they are zealous friends of freedom and progress, yet differ widely, on special points of great practical concern, both from the Editors and from each other.]

THE NEW ROUND TABLE:

COMMUNICATIONS FROM

ANDREW REID.

LADY ROBINSON.

SIR WALTER FOSTER, M.P.

THE RT. HON. W. E. GLADSTONE, M.P.

LORD MONKSWELL.

THE RT. HON. EARL OF ASHBURNHAM.

W. J. EVELYN.

Would the Conservative party lose anything if they were to settle the Irish question? Would either their fortunes or their principles be at stake in such an enterprise? Would they, if they were to abandon the Unionists and take up a strong position in English affairs, be worse off than they are now with a policy which cannot be victorious at the general election, and which must expose them to great moral humiliation?

Would it not be better for them to escape from the swarm of accusations, the procession of inconsistencies, the panorama of battering-rams, ruined homesteads, Mitchelstowns, forged letters, imprisoned patriots, prayers to Rome, and the thousand other "flaming incidents of coercion"—is it wise for them, with their light brigade, to charge at the general election into the mouth of all this damning history, with cannon on right and cannon on left volleying and thundering?

The sagacious statesman will draw these conclusions:—

1. That the Unionists' policy is a losing concern.
2. That no remedial whitewash will hide the blackness and filthiness of the coercion walls from the popular eye.
3. That a violent and repugnant policy, like their present

one—or any other inventable or imaginable one—short of Home Rule, cannot be carried on without a large majority.

4. That this majority it is not possible for the Unionists to obtain in the next Parliament.

5. That the House of Lords can never again be the refuge of any party against the people. It could only afford a night's lodgings, for in the morning it would be in flames, and by evening in ashes.

6. That after the general turn-out, the "Liberal Unionists," as a party, would be no more in the House of Commons. If they were there, more or less, they would be there by Tory votes, which it had been wiser to have given to real Conservatives.

It is evident that, whatever is to be done, should be done quickly. Time is a great consideration. If the Conservatives were to go to market now with their Home Rule produce, the Liberals and the Irish party might be ready buyers against time. In another year we shall be so near the general election that the Unionists would have nothing to offer the latter, who might then prefer the glorious issues of war to the diplomatic bargains of peace.

It is of some consequence to the Unionists that they should have ample occasion to get into their new policy before the general election.

The advantages on the side of the Conservatives, by their settlement of this Irish business, are tremendous.

1. The Irish party would be drawn out of English affairs. The Liberals in the future would be left alone to do battle with the Tories.

2. The Irish landlords and the Protestants of Ulster might be able to secure better arrangements than they would do from the victorious Liberals.

3. What would, perhaps, be the most splendid stroke of business for the Unionists—they could almost disestablish and disendow Mr. Gladstone himself. If the great leader of the Liberal party were suddenly precipitated from the Irish question, it would not be easy for him to be at home and inspire a new cause at short notice. He would hardly be able to raise them to the same pitch of enthusiasm as that to which he has now worked them. If the Unionists could only tumble Mr. Gladstone from an international and world-watched struggle to the low level of three acres and a cow, where he must take a back seat behind Mr. Jesse Collings, it is possible that the spell of his entrancing eloquence and personality might be broken in the future as the leader of the Liberal party.

The Irish question gives exactly that kind of inspiration, attraction, and materials which can sustain and bring out Mr. Gladstone. He is by history, affinity, and quality, every inch a national liberator. No one on earth to-day or yesterday can reach near to him as the

champion of nations. His speeches on behalf of the Canadian people, delivered when he was still a young man, read very much like some of those he is delivering now on behalf of Ireland. Bring this magnificent nationalist down to ground rents, one man one vote—sugar plums—and possibly you will reduce him to the condition of Samson under the shears of the she-barber.

In 1886 Mr. Gladstone announced in a letter to the writer that he only hung on to the Irish question in the hope of settling it, and that he must leave to younger men the Liberal programme of the future. Thank God! he is still preserved to us in almost youthful vigour. But it is evident that, with the Home Rule movement at an end, Mr. Gladstone might not be inclined to throw into a new one the immense power which he has cast into the present agitation. This tremendous loss to the Liberals will be an equal gain to the Conservatives. It has been stated that some of the most vulgar of the Unionists have been counting up this grand statesman's years. Well, if they wish manfully to get rid of Mr. Gladstone, let them get rid of the Irish question by an Irish parliament. On the Home Rule course all Liberals are rowing with enthusiasm in the same boat. On a new course and in a new boat they might not pull so well together. If the Unionists were to push the Liberal party into a strange programme, the latter would very likely suffer a great split the second time, and at a very early date. There is upon the Land question a serious and gaping rent of opinion amongst its members. They are at present blundering and floundering along, half a century behind time. The popular mind is far ahead of them and is going at a swinging pace in a direction which is quite another one from that which the Liberals are taking. The crisis will come, and a big slit.

Then there is the House of Lords. Is it to be abolition or reconstruction? The Liberal party will temporarily be severely shaken when the multitude thunder "Down with it." The fall of the House of Lords will be the fall of the British aristocracy as an hereditary ruling-class, and some of its present members are distinguished leaders of the Liberal party.

The Dissenters will goad the leaders of the Liberal party on to attempt the demolition of the State pillars of the English Church.

The growing moral and numerical strength of Socialism will eventually make it so powerful within a few years, as to force Liberalism to leave off its Bond Streeters, sell them for old clo', and put on fustian.

If the Unionists were to plunge the Liberals into a struggle with all the currents now roaring below, by throwing them from the Home Rule suspension-bridge, it is possible that, while the rushing streams might not be strong enough to carry the muscular Radicals out of their depth, the whirling and foaming might place the weak-kneed Liberals in a very unpleasant position. If the Tories put out a ^{hen}boat,

depend upon it many of the weak-kneed would jump in, and be willing to land on the Conservative side. It is necessary for the Unionists to give as long a lease as possible before the general election for the elements of discord to work.

Why should the Conservatives hesitate? Why should not Lord Salisbury return to his position in 1885? Why not let fall once again upon our ears those pregnant allusions to Austria-Hungary? Why not ask Lord Carnarvon this time to lead the Irish chief to an Irish parliament instead of to an empty house and vacant premises? Let us sum up what they would gain by settling this Irish business:—

1. They would detach the Irish party from the Liberals in English questions.

2. They could retain the Liberal Unionists.

3. They might be able to make better terms for the Irish landlords and the Ulster minority than the latter would get from the Liberals.

Now, what do the objections of the Unionists against an Irish parliament amount to? There is no one who can see better than Lord Salisbury that half these objections are unreal. By some blunder those that are real open fire upon ~~one~~ another, and are still so hotly engaged as to leave to an enemy only the duty of burying the dead.

One of the two great generals of the Unionist armies might well mistake the position of the other for that of their foes. Lord Salisbury's position is that the Irish movement is an agrarian one, and that, if it were a grand national rising, he would respect it. Lord Hartington's is directly opposite to this, so far as we can view it through a field-glass:—That the Irish movement is dangerous because it is national, and that he would patronize it if it were a municipal one, and national sentiment were drained like sewage into the Irish seas, or applied to raising Irish potatoes. Lord Salisbury, however, has himself somewhat confused the situation by declaring that this simple and rustic movement in Ireland is a naval one, and that it will seize the Irish harbours.

The objections against Home Rule may be divided into two—(1) the military arguments, and (2) the minority arguments.

We will take the minority situation first. It might have some relation to the military question, if it could be shown by the Unionists that in Ireland there is a powerful population which is loyal to this country. If an Irish parliament will convert them into rebels, their loyalty is not worth a pinch of snuff. What, however, is the wise opinion of Lord Salisbury as to half this minority? That it is of such doubtful utility to Ireland that we should do well to get it out of the country. Dual ownership of the Irish soil he has declared to be unsatisfactory. The very peasants whose hovels he is laying low, he would raise into the position of the landlords of Ireland. Well,

if one-half of this minority is to go, Irish parliament or no Irish parliament, let it go. Going or gone, it is not a permanent obstacle to Home Rule.

As to the other half. Do the Protestants of Ireland believe that the Westminster Parliament will protect them any more than an Irish legislature, where they will be a great deal stronger than they are now? Let them reflect upon the disestablishment of the Irish State Church. Let them remember the voyages of Lord Salisbury's ambassadors to Rome. And they must now be in a state of agitation from the proposal of Mr. Balfour to endow a Roman Catholic University.

It seems to have escaped attention that Mr. Gladstone's scheme of the two orders would have established a chamber, if not a parliament, for Ulster. Would it meet more the feeling of the people of Ulster, if, instead of two orders, Ireland should have two Houses of One Parliament, and that one House should sit at Belfast? I should propose the same plan for Scotland: One Parliament of two Houses, and one House sitting at Glasgow, the other at Edinburgh. It is possible that the Liberal party would not only agree to this, but to the Ulster House being temporarily nominated by the Crown—say one half, and the other half elected by the people. We mean political and not geographical Ulster. Is it necessary to remind the Protestants of Ireland that in this island Protestants form an overwhelming and almost crushing majority, and that it would be absolutely impossible for them to sit quiet and leave their co-religionists to be harmed even so much as by a hair of their heads.

Turn now to the military situation of the Union. It would remain absolutely unchanged, except for the better, by the interposition of an Irish parliament. A parliament cannot take the field without an army. A parliament is not a regiment. The Irish people are just as able to bring about separation without as with an Irish legislature. Lord Salisbury has said that an Irish legislature would leave open the Irish harbours to a foreign fleet. But now, were it not for the Gladstone policy, every Irish bosom would be an open harbour to England's foes.

The argument, on the one side, that an Irish parliament would lead to separation, and the argument on the other side, that, instead, an Irish legislature would lead to consolidation, are reasonings into the future which will not get us much nearer one another in the present.

If these arguments on the one side and on the other exactly balanced each other, there would still be in both scales the sword, and in the Liberal scale the sword would be sharper and stronger. Instead of playing at resolute Government by shaving off a rebel's moustache, England, by Home Rule invincible in her conscience and her liberty, would slice off every rebel's head in Ireland which conspired against the integrity of the Union.

The population on this island is not a question of debate—it is a matter of the census. It is a humiliation for a courageous people—almost omnipotent in numbers in comparison with the Irish people—to let it be known to the world that they are afraid of an Irish parliament. They afraid! They, who in history have vaunted themselves that England is the mother of liberty! It would be better that we sacrificed Ireland than England. And if her reputation for freedom and courage is gone, she is no more England. Thus do you Unionists maintain “the integrity of the Empire” by trumpeting to the world that England is afraid of an Irish parliament!

It is impossible to resist the demand of Ireland except on the plea that the direct necessity leaves you no choice but to resist. You confess, then, that you yourselves are as much suffering under coercion as the Irish people, if you are lovers of liberty. How miserable and untruthful, however, is the plea! For, when this dire necessity has really arrived, and the enemy is pressing your armies hard in battle, your resolute Government will knock its knees and surrender under the most humiliating and disastrous circumstances to Ireland, because, after all, that is better than surrender to an enemy.

Home Rule is inevitable. In Ireland it can only be resisted in the name of the minority. In England, Scotland, and Wales, it can no longer with any confidence be withstood in the name of the majority.

Will you prepare for the inevitable? Why not bring in a scheme of Home Rule accompanied with plans for the consolidation and reorganization of our Army and Navy? The stability of the Union should be maintained, not by demolishing home liberties, but by increasing our military resources. Military resources are not alone great guns—they are also great hearts in love with country. Leave battering-rams and Irish cabins alone, and take to Armstrong guns and Irish fortresses. High rents will not protect the Union, but high forts might. Bigotry is no use on the battle-field, and a minority is a poor army to send out against an enemy. A good battery and a strong majority would give a much better account of themselves. The despotism of arms should be enough for England's conscience and safety without adding to it in Ireland the coercion of laws. Instead of a parliament you have reared in Ireland the prison for the Irish representatives. Had you put up a fortress you might have done better.

Lord Hartington, in his character as a Liberal, has let us know that all is not lost. There is the House of Lords. Now, we have advised the Unionists that their best policy is to let down Mr. Gladstone and the Liberal party upon a cold and damp programme without any fire. To make them a present of the dry timber in the House of Lords to keep the Irish question blazing, is not a sagacious policy. Mr. Gladstone has expressed himself harmlessly upon the

hereditary principle of our constitution. He might be of service in moderating the popular currents of the future. Place, however, the hereditary walls between him and his final and mighty purpose in this world, and the fatal battering-ram will be laid at their tottering sides. For the Conservatives, all will be lost and nothing gained—neither honour, nor power, nor estate.

If you Conservatives do not believe in Home Rule, you will believe in the rule of three. You will be able to add up the losses of the Unionists at the bye-elections, and calculate how many of the Liberal dissentients will be in the House of Commons after the general turn-out. Now, there is such a thing as Conservatives being converted into Liberals. There is such a thing as neutrals and indifferentists becoming earnest Radicals. You may think that to go on for another year or two with the coercion policy will do no harm to your fortunes, and that, if you have to be turned into Home Rulers, another year will be a more convenient season than this. Remember that the people of this country in 1886 were in profound ignorance of Irish history and English rule in Ireland. It is not possible for you to play upon that ignorance again. The most lamentable spectacle in Ireland is that of the Conservative party, which is supposed to love existing institutions, throwing itself against the most ancient and powerful institutions in the world—the family and the nation. You will find in a little time that the Cabin in Ireland is a greater institution than the Cabinet in England. The nation is older than the Union, and the family older than the nation. These evictions will not clear out of Ireland the enemies to the Union. Do you destroy the homes of the peasants because you are against Home Rule? What is “the Union?” Is it a landlord’s estate? Is it a Protestant’s Church? It is something greater than a nobleman’s barony, and loftier than a church steeple. If an Irish legislature were to lower rack rents and creeds in Ireland, would that lower the Union? Let the Irish people defend their country by Irish laws, the Union is safe whilst it can be protected by British arms. A Parliament is as natural to a people as their eyes. As no one man can do all the seeing for the world, so no one people can do all the governing for creation. No Parliament can be omnipotent, omniscient, and omnipresent. The blunders which a democracy may make will fall upon their own heads, and in the long run they are sure to go right. The Irish are certain to do no harm to Ireland. They love her too well.

With the British sentinel at the door of the Irish parliament, how shall Ireland escape out of the Union? With Irish sentiment at the gate of the Union, how shall an enemy get in? The coercion of geography we cannot help, but the coercion of lithography we have, no right to impose upon Ireland. It is impertinence to write her laws on our tables of stone.

When the Liberals meet you as a triumphant and overwhelming majority in the new Parliament, don't you imagine that they will get rid of a single man of the Irish party. Mr. Gladstone has said something about a less number of the Irish Members at Westminster when Home Rule has come in. The Irish people will have, however, the same proportional interest in the Union as the other nations in it, according to population, as now. The House of Lords is a question which concerns the Irish people, for the constitution of the Westminster Parliament concerns them. The Liberals may keep back Home Rule whilst you are crying bitterly for it, in order first of all to settle some English questions, with the help of their Irish friends. You will look rather small then. How you will repent that you did not get the Irish representatives out of the way before the General Election!

What a different position from the present will be yours when the Liberals are in possession of the government of this country. Your obstruction, then, may be your destruction. Your closure and coercion may be turned against you. Nothing will delight the people of these two islands more than to see Mr. Gladstone, as his last campaign, leading them against the House of Lords. With one man one vote, the Liberals will sweep the country for years. Look to your entailed estates. Consider your vested interests in England. Will the Union save them? Will you, for the sake of coercion in Ireland, lose all in England? These evictions in Ireland will not teach the democracy to respect your country seats. Nothing can be a worse policy for you than to set the castle against the hovel.

Now is your opportunity! Bring in with an Irish Home Rule measure a Scotch Home Rule Bill and a Welsh Home Rule Bill. This would leave the English Liberals with their strongest allies drawn away from the English field.

ANDREW REID.

I have always failed to see why a Conservative should not also be a Home Ruler. If it is impossible to consider this country as in a fairly satisfactory condition, while yet recognizing that there may be need for drastic reform in another part of our Empire, then it seems to me Conservatism stands self-condemned. No doubt, in fact, that when the Tories were standing on platforms with the Irish members, and paying the printing expenses of the National League, many people found the two sets of opinions by no means incompatible. Between the present Government and the Irish leaders there is now the "great gulf fixed" of the Pigott letters; but is it too much to hope that a day will come when Conservatives of sense and humanity—of whom Sir Michael Hicks-Beach and Sir Redvers Buller are honourable examples—will cease to vote for candidates whose only message to Ireland is—coercion for ever and ever? Home Rule would be,

in the best sense, a Conservative measure. It would restore to Ireland, in an improved and perfected form, as befits the altered times, the status she formerly possessed. It would place law and order on a really stable footing, resting, namely, on the will of a free people, and it would drive from the field agitators, if any such there be—Conservatives assure us they exist—who make a trade out of the present ferment of discontent.

The day will come, when the stress and heat of the battle are over and the dust cleared away, when Conservatives will wonder that they should have been blind to the nobility of the temper with which the Irish people are passing through the present supreme crisis of their fate. Their splendid loyalty to their leaders, their fine self-restraint under intolerable provocation, and their generous attitude towards ourselves, will be one day remembered as a source of pride to an united people. The Irish know they have no quarrel with their English brothers, and they are willing, after all that has come and gone, to let "the dead past bury its dead." The Irish genius is essentially conservative; witness their passionate fidelity during long centuries of oppression and persecution, to their ancient faith and nationality. When justice no longer presents itself to them in the form of a travestie of all the rights of citizenship, this bent will, happily, assert itself, and may be so strong as only to reach equilibrium when balanced by their equally keen love of education and culture. Irishmen are imbued with an almost instinctive sentiment of reverence; and once this was enlisted for, instead of against, their rulers, and the land question settled on a wide and generous basis, they would become a conservative people in the highest sense of the term, second to no race on earth in all the noble qualities that go to make up the life of a nation.

WINIFRED ROBINSON.

That it is to the interest of the Tory party to get the Irish question out of the way quickly is, I think, open to some doubt. They obtained in 1886 an immediate gain from it in the shape of place and power. They have since largely used these to help their friends, as, for example, by the extension of the Ashbourne Act, and they have enrolled permanently in their ranks a number of timid Liberals and tuft-hunting Radicals, who guarantee them the longest possible tenure of office. The party of privilege and property has consolidated under this Government. These are further gains. If they could keep up the old prejudice against Ireland and the Irish among the people, they might even keep the Liberals out of power for many years. That they have not succeeded in this attempt, the bye-elections have clearly shown. These elections have also disclosed the fact that the home legislation of the Government has failed to influence the masses, and

there is consequently no *cry* left to the Tory party, except any adroit appeals they can still make to the animosities of prejudice, and to the apprehensions of property. The Irish question gives them such a *cry*. On the other hand, the Tories run a grave risk by continued opposition to Home Rule, from the invigorating effect of that policy on the Liberal party. The Irish question is to all Liberals the question of poverty and oppression, and English politicians in studying it have had their hearts touched, as never before, by the piteous and perennial poverty of the Irish peasant. Henceforth, to men with sympathies thus quickened, all social reforms for the benefit of the working-classes will assume a new and an urgent importance. By thus keeping the Irish question to the front, the Tory party are rapidly ripening a whole host of reforms that will touch their individual interests, and hasten the conflict between the powers of privilege and property (the rights as opposed to the duties) on the one hand, and democratic progress on the other. On this account it is to their interest to settle the Irish problem; but I am very doubtful if men who have so misrepresented Home Rule claims, and so vividly portrayed the dangers and disasters which self-government will bring to Ireland and reflect on England, can be trusted to settle the Irish question as thoroughly as it should be settled. The great Bill of Mr. Gladstone gave in the two "Orders" the strongest security for the minority, to say nothing of its other provisions, and no scheme on narrower lines would satisfy Ireland or Great Britain. To do work well, statesmen, as well as other workers, must believe in their work, and a profession of belief in Home Rule on the part of the present Government would betray a nimbleness of principle unequalled even in Disraelian days. The settlement of the question is, however, so urgent in the interests of good government, and even in the interests of humanity in Ireland, that I would gladly see it attempted even by the present Government.

WALTER FOSTER.

In my opinion, after all that has happened, the Irish question cannot be settled by the Tory leaders except by a complete surrender involving the blackest treachery to their Unionist allies. The surrender of 1867 was followed by the disaster of 1868—not a seductive precedent.

True, the lot of the Tories is not a happy one. Mr. Chamberlain's oft-repeated boast that he is dragging them at his heels and has crammed the unauthorized programme down their throats, makes his patronage well-nigh intolerable to the good old Tory; but the party-managers know that, by conjuring up the Demon of Disruption, stragglers can be frightened back to the ranks. Will the Tories consider it "good business" to bury their "bogey"?

I cannot conscientiously advise the Tories to have anything to do with any scheme of Home Rule that can by any possibility be acceptable to Ireland.

MONKSWELL.

The proposal that the Irish parliament should consist of two Houses, one sitting at Dublin and the other at Belfast, appears to me unacceptable for the following reasons:—

(1.) It is designed to meet what is called the "Ulster difficulty." Now, personally, I do not believe that, if a parliament were given to Ireland, there would be any "Ulster difficulty." I state this as an opinion which I am free at present to hold, as those who think otherwise are free to hold theirs; but it is evident that neither they nor I can pretend to absolute certainty without begging the entire question. For what is this "Ulster difficulty?" It is nothing but a belief or an apprehension on the part of certain Protestants in Ireland that, in the event of an Irish parliament being established, they would be persecuted, or in some way unfairly used, by the Catholic majority which such a Parliament would presumably contain. This belief or apprehension is professed by a certain number of Irish Protestants. It is declared to be utterly unfounded and absurd by the entire body of Irish Catholics, by many Irish Protestants, and by Mr. Parnell, himself a Protestant, and one who has undeniably had exceptional opportunities of making himself acquainted with the aims and aspirations of his Catholic countrymen.

Now it is obvious that until an Irish parliament shall have been established, its proceedings can only be a matter of surmise on either side, and it seems to me that, if there were no other objection to Home Rule than the fears of its adversaries upon this particular score, and no other argument in its favour than the re-assuring declarations with which they are met by its advocates, both parties might well agree to try the experiment, in order to settle the question once for all.

The Protestants would incur no serious risk, for it is certain that, if the slightest attempt were made to persecute or molest them, all parties in Great Britain would at once unite to undo a work which had produced such deplorable consequences. If it be objected that this might be an arduous task, I answer that, as it is not now found very difficult for one party to exercise coercion in the teeth of the most strenuous opposition from the other, it could be exercised by both together with the greatest ease and certain success.

If, on the other hand, no such persecution ensued, if it became manifest that the lives, the liberties, and the rights of the Protestants were in all respects as absolutely secure as those of the Catholics, surely then the "Ulster difficulty" would vanish of its own accord, for it is inconceivable that any sane person at the present

day can desire to claim for the Protestants of Ireland more than perfect equality with their Catholic fellow-subjects. In the meanwhile, to refuse the demands of the majority because a minority opposes them, seems to be a somewhat anomalous proceeding, and to imply the adoption of a principle which, if carried to its logical conclusion, would lead to the recognition of the right of minorities, under all circumstances, to impose their will upon majorities.

(2.) It does not appear to me that the remedy termed "geographical" is appropriate to the "Ulster difficulty," which, if it exists at all, is assuredly by no means purely geographical. It is the fashion of the day to employ conventional phrases without much regard to their true signification, and thus Ulster is very commonly spoken of as if, in the first place, its entire population were Protestants, and as if, in the second place, there were no other Protestants in Ireland. But, as a matter of fact, there are a great many Catholics in Ulster, and a great many Protestants disseminated throughout the other provinces; and if any Protestants in Ireland required protection against Catholic intolerance, it would clearly be rather in these other provinces, where they are comparatively few and weak, than in Ulster, where they form a numerous and powerful body. I fail to see how a parliament in Belfast could protect the victims of religious intolerance within the jurisdiction of a parliament in Dublin.

(3.) It is incomprehensible to me that there should be so much discussion as to the ways and means of protecting the interests of minorities, civil or religious, in Ireland, when there exists, ready to the hand of the legislator, an instrument originally created and still admirably adapted, for the purpose in the Irish Peerage, an instrument, moreover, of which the destruction has never, so far as I am aware, been proposed or contemplated except as part and parcel of the scheme of those who would abolish the House of Lords altogether. I express no opinion upon this design; it is enough for me to point out that it has not yet been accomplished, and to submit that, so long as there are Lords and Commons in the Parliament of Great Britain, it would be inconsistent and unjust to debar the Irish peers from sitting in the parliament of Ireland. It may be objected that the Irish peers are, almost to a man, opposed to the establishment of an Irish parliament, but it must be remembered that hitherto they have not been offered seats in it, and it is hardly conceivable that the same unanimity of opposition would prevail among them if it were made clear that they would be guaranteed their full and fair share in the government of their country. It would be strange indeed if any considerable percentage of them should prove to be too stiff-necked to bow to the inevitable when presented to them in so re-assuring and even attractive a form.

As for the Nationalist party, I believe that I shall not be contra-

dicted if I say that, when Mr. Gladstone introduced his Home Rule Bill in 1886, its leaders would have cheerfully acquiesced in a proposal for the restoration of the Irish House of Lords, and I have no reason to suppose that a similar proposal would be rejected by them now. However this may be, I venture to declare my own absolute conviction that no scheme for the restoration of a parliament to Ireland can be consistent, rational, equitable, effectual, or satisfactory which does not include the restoration to the Irish Lords of those ancient rights and privileges of which they, no less than the Irish Commons, were robbed at the Union.

ASHBURNHAM.

To me it seems that the Irish question should not be made a battle-ground for party, and that, in the name of humanity and decency, men of all parties should unite in putting an end to Lord Salisbury's monstrous system of (so-called) "resolute government" of Ireland. Though a Conservative, I trust that Mr. Gladstone may have an opportunity of settling the Irish question in accordance with the just aspirations of the Irish people, as expressed through their representatives in Parliament.

I should think that the simplest plan would be to revive the Parliamentary system of 1782 (without its abuses), by retaining two separate chambers, and not having the Irish Members in the Imperial Parliament at Westminster.

I would certainly leave such matters as the land question and the establishment of a Catholic university to be settled by the Irish parliament.

I agree with the principle that the next Home Rule Bill should be characterized by simplicity.

W. J. EVELYN.

I agree with Mr. Reid in thinking it useful and important to open the minds of the Tory party to (what I think manifestly is) the fact—

1. That it is for their interest to get the Irish question out of the way.
2. That the settlement of it would largely increase their Parliamentary strength.
3. That, as Mr. Reid justly observes, the scheme of the two "Orders" constitutes a powerful protection to the minority.
4. That the Liberals, as a party, have no other interest in carrying it than the honour of doing what is just, politic, and generous.

W. E. GLADSTONE.

THE NATURAL EVOLUTION OF MAN.

INTERESTING as most speculations are regarding man's origin and descent, none compare with the story unfolded by to-day evolutionists. The first results of the evolutionary theory were to take from him the belief in his divine creation in Eden, to rank him as a natural phenomenon amid countless others, and to class him, by an inference from Darwin's hypothesis, among the narrow-nosed apes.

Accurate scientists, however, now perceive that while man's origin and development, in common with other animals, have been doubtless effected in some way by evolution from a lower grade of being, the evidence involves neither a serial nor a genealogical transformation of presently-known forms, but rather a direct evolution of distinct genera from distinct genetic primordial ovules.

According to the Darwinian theory of organic evolution, the primordial source of all living forms was a cell or germ (originally brought into being by a creator) which transformed itself by the natural selection of favourable variations from a unicellular to a multicellular organism; from one vegetal to another, and from one animal to another, multiplying its numbers at each stage, and developing its own peculiarities genealogically until the myriad living forms of the present day are, at last, the result. These forms may again in turn become the progenitors of many other animal species yet to arise in the far future.

But it did not occur to Darwin that one cell could hardly create a struggle for existence. With no enemies or rivals, and no call for natural selection to act, the only selection was "Hobson's choice." Again, according to the method of cellular reproduction, one cell could not be radically transformed into two different specific cells, even though it were multicellular. Hence, though the first cell, with only itself and its own offspring to contend, and all the world to seed over, might develop variations of itself; but the possibility of the evolution or transformation of new species and genera from it is incredible. For instance, if the first cell were an amœba, the ocean would be stocked with varieties of amœbæ and nothing else.

Further, judging from the known modes of action in matter, the production in some favourable epoch of only one primordial germ on earth would be well-nigh impossible. Grant favourable conditions for the evolution of one germ the one hundred and twenty-fifth of

an inch in diameter, through the alteration of natural forces, and one must grant, also, that similar conditions in the same or other spots would inevitably produce hundreds, if not thousands, of similar primordial germs.

The theory of universal transformation from one germ was assured from the apparent likeness of vegetal and animal cells to homogeneous lumps of protoplasm (such bodies being without apparent organization), and from the fact that evolution up to the gastrula stage shows physiological variation. But, with our imperfect vision and restricted appliances, to dogmatize on homogeneousness and likeness in minute bodies containing millions of invisible molecules, is ignorant presumption. The very fact of seemingly-similar cells developing into very dissimilar organisms remarkably conservative in type and persistent in duration, as most prozoota are, should render us chary of deducing hasty judgments; for, notwithstanding all their likeness and apparent homogeneousness, cells may indubitably be not only heterogeneous in composition, but excessively complex in structure.

Scientists are gradually throwing overboard the extreme Darwinian theory. "Now-a-days," says Herbert Spencer, "most naturalists are more Darwinian than Darwin himself . . . for, far from further broadening that broader view which Mr. Darwin reached as he grew older, his followers appear to have retrograded towards a more restricted view than he ever expressed."¹ Professor Huxley, too, in unveiling Darwin's statue, deprecated the supposition that an authoritative sanction was given by the ceremony to the current ideas concerning organic evolution, in saying, "Science commits suicide when it adopts a creed." Recent theories put forward by Messrs. Romanes, Wallace, and Spencer of "Physiological," "Colour," and "Embryological"² selections respectively, all further indicate a terrible reaction against the officious decaloguing by injudicious evolutionists of miniature Darwinian principles. Lastly, the bulk of the argument in the *Origin of Species*, as also most of the writing on evolution since, which indicates the tendency of progressive scientific thought, is distinctly in favour of abiogenesis,³ while the doctrine of transmutation from one or a few germs, which the book also contains, is at best but a secondary theory, adding nothing to the main link of the argument.

In place, therefore, of the hypothesis of the divine creation of one or a few primordial germs, and natural evolution therefrom, we deduce from the evidence before us an hypothesis which argues that genera, if not species, had an independent origin in an equally, or

¹ *Factors of Organic Evolution.*

² Or what is virtually so in his recent *Factors of Organic Evolution.*

³ "Abiogenesis aids the theory of evolution by tracing the organic into the inorganic, and would believe Natural Selection with its attendant causes from what many consider the too-Herculean labour of evolving all species from one or a very few primary forms."—"Abiogenesis," *Ency. Brit.*

nearly equally, ancient protoplasmic form, spontaneously evolved from the universal mother—Matter in Motion.

Man, like vegetals and animals, consists of proteids, albumin, gluten, febrine, sintonin, &c.—substances not met with in mineral bodies. Decomposed, these proteids resolve themselves into carbon, hydrogen, oxygen, nitrogen, &c.—primary elements equally common to minerals as to vegetals and animals. Though man, therefore, in his substance, differs secondarily, he does not differ primarily from other organic and inorganic products; even from sticks, stones, or rubbish; from the air he breathes, the water he drinks, the food he eats, or the soil on which he treads. Further, although every animal organism is a compound of unstable elements which ceaselessly add themselves to the body and leave it again with every breath which is drawn, yet that same changing substance, as far as human thought can follow it, is indestructible, and reproduces itself in endless other forms throughout the cycles of eternity.

The quaint conception of man's divine creation some six thousand years ago in the garden of Eden has, in our own day, been discredited by criticism, disproved by geology, and discarded by all intelligent men; and, now, recent discoveries of pre-historic human remains come to establish conclusively the existence of man in the miocene epoch of the Tertiary age. This implies an antiquity of hundreds of thousands, if not millions of years. Further, if those pre-Adamites were evolved from apes, or from some ape-progenitor, as Darwinians allege, then that transformation, at the same ratio of progress, must be ante-dated by other millions of years.

But, although Darwin propounded man's descent from some common progenitor of the Catarrhine (narrow-nosed) or old-world apes, he added, "We must not fall into the error of supposing that the early progenitor of the whole Simian stock, including man, was identical with, or even closely resembled, any existing ape or monkey."¹ Hence, pressing this point in an endeavour to trace man's true line of descent as well as his absolute origin, we find virtual unanimity between Darwin, the old Atomists, and the most pronounced materialists. For this ancient ancestor and common progenitor of man and ape was, according to Huxley, in all probability, descended from some amphibian—not a present form of amphibian, but some extinct type. This extinct amphibian's progenitor in turn was, probably, descended from some extinct type of fish; this fish from some arthropod; this arthropod from some mollusc; this mollusc from some coelenterate; this coelenterate from some protozoon; this protozoon from some lump of protoplasm, which lump of protoplasm was the assumed primordial form, the ancestor of all the ages. Protoplasm, however, is not a simple, but a compound substance—not a unit, but a mass;

¹ *Descent of Man*, part i., chap. vi.

hence the source of human ancestry is not lumps of protoplasm, but protoplasm's indecomposable constituents, oxygen, hydrogen, carbon, &c.—the fundamental chemical elements of the universe. In effect, by Darwin's own words, the theory of man's transmutation from some kind of actual ape to man-form is discarded if it was ever seriously entertained, and is replaced by the doctrine of direct descent from matter to man, which matter has metamorphosed itself through amoeba-like, fish-like, toad-like, and ape-like phases. Hence, in thoroughly unravelling human origin, we must transcend all organic forms whatsoever, and acknowledge man's fundamental, material, and engerial origin solely in matter and its motion; finally deducing that while man's primordial ovule may have been generated either divinely or spontaneously some millions of years ago, more or less, his first origin materially dates, like that of all phenomenal components known to us, from the commencement, at least, of terrestrial existence.

When the terror of the orthodox at the enunciation of Darwinian evolution subsided, and men reassumed their reasoning faculties, the shrewder clerical intellects soon announced that evolution and religion were beautifully harmonious, and that scientists and theists are truly brothers. Thus, said they, if an Omnipotent Creator could create at all, it was not more difficult for him to endow primeval germs with potencies sufficient to evolve gradually into men, than to fashion the full-grown Adam from the dust. The one involved no greater miracle than the other, hence there was nothing at variance with the worship, at least, of a God.

But, why stop here? If the Creator implanted in germs the seed of infinite evolution, He could also implant in inanimate matter (of which all animals, as well as germs, are fundamentally composed) potencies sufficient to produce the germs themselves. But this being so, why not assume matter's possession of these properties as inherent constituents of its very existence, rather than its inoculation of them by a Deity? The assumption of an inoculating Deity actually introduces greater difficulties than it removes. Thus, if we have a right to ask how matter became possessed of these assumed inherent properties, we have an equal right to ask how the Deity became possessed of His inherent properties, and so on interminably. Present intelligence, therefore, demands that we stop our questionings at the barrier we know something of—Matter; not the barrier we know nothing of—Deity.

Again, if the Deity exist, the fact of His existence involves Him to be at least something—not nothing. Further, as, according to Hobbes, "motion only causeth motion," the Deity could not communicate energy or motion to matter unless He were Himself matter to move and cause motion. His sole energy is therefore virtually resolved into the motion of His matter. Again, any Deity cognizable by or knowable to us could only be so known to us by other matter

communicating with our matter through the motion of our material senses, the divine matter impinging on our human matter; this practically implies that divine matter and human matter are identical.

In other words, the hypothesis of man's supernatural creation being inadmissible because void of evidence, contrary to reason, and exceeding scientific demonstration, the alternative agency, seemingly to the evolutionist, is spontaneous or abiogenetic generation by natural laws in eternal matter. But spontaneous generation is, at present, discredited by leading evolutionists (Huxley, Tyndall, Pasteur, and others), because, according to their experiments, living animals do not generate from inorganic elements under practically inanimate conditions. For instance, anti-abiogenesisists boil and bottle up infusions, expecting life to be evolved and sustained under conditions entailed on no known life; and, failing, they wonder why incipient germs are not Shadrachs, Meshachs and Abed-negos, able to pass through fiery furnaces unconsumed; as if Nature, merely for the purposes of popular experiment, should conveniently provide ovules with steel stomachs and cast-iron pseudopodia. Biological experiments and scientific reasoning are so equally balanced for and against spontaneous generation at present, that scientists generally are sceptics waiting further developments. Both cannot be right; and we assume, provisionally, the presence of only one something in existence—*matter*; and only one energy—the *motion of the matter*; and, therefore, that spontaneous generation through the action of the matter in suitable conditions is inevitable, even granting our ignorance of its mode.

The orthodox dread of the term spontaneous generation is needless, for it is not a law of creation, but a term covering other laws; not a cause itself, but a term expressive of the real causes. In fact, it only means chance generation by automatic laws; chance having reference to the determining conditions, the automatic laws to the actual agents of production. For example, under suitable conditions of heat, moisture, light, air, &c., a mass of matter containing carbon, oxygen, nitrogen, hydrogen, sulphur, &c., must, in virtue of its indestructibility and inherent mutual affinities, likes and dislikes, attractions and repulsions, automatically develop (for matter cannot rest), first, from inorganic, or so-called non-living, into living matter or protoplasm; and from thence, solely in virtue of the chance combination of elements composing the mass, and the nature of the structure reared by the irrevocable automatic laws governing atoms and their combinations, must grow into a protoplasmic vegetable or animal form. This form, again, may, as its structure, components, and environments automatically determine, either remain protoplasmic or become an amoeba, develop into one or other of the thousands of protozoic forms, and gradually metamorphose (disturbing conditions being

absent) into a fish, an amphibian, a reptile, a bird, a mammal, or even a man.

We thus assert, what all evidence confirms, that there is nothing in the vital conditions of animal evolution opposed to the generation of any animal whatsoever. The orthodox, however, ask, with orthodox logic, if man evolved spontaneously by natural laws thousands of years ago, why is he not evolved spontaneously now, and why cannot we trace him in some of his lower transitions, his ape-like, frog-like, fish-like oyster-like, and amceba-like phases? The answer is obvious. If man evolved from a particular chance combination of atoms at some particular juncture of conditions æons ago, the recurrence of this particular juncture is tremendously improbable, especially when untold millions of possible organic combinations are equally open to inorganic matter. Besides, Nature, like an original artist, prefers to create a new form rather than copy an old one in her vast atelier. Further, even supposing some human progenitors were passing a period of painful pre-human probation among the Protozoa, the Cœlenterata, the Mollusca, the Annulosa, or the lower vertebrata now, how could we possibly recognize them as our brethren?

All animal ovules, man's included, are alike in appearance and development. Each is a nucleated cell, consisting of a cell-wall, enclosing protoplasmic elements in solution, carbon, oxygen, hydrogen, &c. An impregnated cell attracts and aggregates like protoplasmic components from its environments, this action constituting growth. After attaining maturity, it divides similarly to the vegetal cell, thus indicating a common origin and development of both animal and vegetal energy and life. Continued fission, or cell-division, results in an aggregate of cells or cell-aggregate; then follows the formation of an external layer of small polyhedral cells round the cell-aggregate called the blastoderm; the interior cavity being filled with fluid. Such an organism is called a Planula. Next invagination occurs, or the pushing in of one side of the spheroid planula, until, from a cup, it grows into a double-walled sac with an opening, in other words, a mouth and stomach are formed. This constitutes a gastrula, the simplest ancestral form of the Metazoa (all animals above Protozoa). The outer layer or epidermis of this gastrula is called the *epiblast*, and the inner the *hypoblast*; but, during the process of invagination, a central layer of cells has been growing between the outer and inner layers called the *mesoblast*. The important organic facts in connection with those layers are, that from the epiblast are developed the permanent epidermis and its outgrowths, the nervous system and the organs of sense; from the hypoblast, the alimentary canal, liver, pancreas, &c.; and from the mesoblast, the bones, muscles, heart, blood-vessels, lymphatics, &c.

But though, up to the gastrula stage, the evolution of every

multicellular animal, including man, is *apparently* alike, it is not actually so. For, with millions of molecules in each cell or ovule, the field for differences in molecular organization is practically illimitable. The cells of all animals cannot be absolutely homogeneous, although seemingly so to our senses; hence, generic differentiation must begin, not at the gastrula stage of development, but at the spontaneous creation of the ovule itself from elementary matter. From the gastrula stage, however, a marked differentiation begins, and the hidden constitutional features of each organism become more and more developed until such unlike creatures as fishes, birds and beasts, diverge into their several classes, orders, and genera.

These facts indicate that production and reproduction are chemical and mechanical processes alike in man and the lower animals, and in vegetals and minerals; the generation of a human ovule is a human ovary, differing not fundamentally from the isolation or fusion of an amoeba, the budding of a coral, the fructification of a fungus, or the petrification of a crystal. In all cases organic generation consists of the insulation of a cell, or concrete fragment of matter, embodying the fundamental character, constitution and essence of the organism. A process simple enough in natural operations when we remember that minerals are only infinite aggregations of mineral molecules; vegetals, infinite aggregations of vegetal cells; and animals, infinite aggregations of animal cells. Further, while the conversion of mineral molecules into crystals is due merely to their aggregation in a suitable solution under suitable conditions, the conversion of vegetal and animal cells into ovules or eggs merely happens from their more specialized aggregation in a particular chamber of the organism called the ovary; a modification of growth as natural as the metamorphosis of leaves into flowers and fruit. The mechanical nature of the operation, too, is strikingly evinced by the immense number of ovules and eggs generated by various animals. Witness the daily issue of 80,000 from that organic egg-manufactory—the termite queen; the million and a half laid by the queen bee, and the quintillion deposited by the aphid or plant-louse. Again, the herring produces 25,000 ova, the lump-fish 155,000, the halibut 3,500,000, the sturgeon 7,635,000, and the cod-fish and oyster no less than from nine to ten millions.

Mr. Herbert Spencer, in what might be called a new theory of embryological selection,¹ lately drew public attention to the connection subsisting between an animal and its environments, especially in the lower organisms, as he found therein a cause of differentiation of similar species and development of new species entirely dissociated from Darwin's doctrine of natural selection and survival of the fittest. Perceiving, for instance, how the homogeneous proto-

¹ *The Factors of Organic Evolution.*

plasm of a ruptured rancheria escaping into water envelopes itself, simply through the chemical action of its environments, with a firm peripheral covering, a covering out of which higher animals than gastrulæ primarily evolve all the organs of sense and the nervous system, he suggests that the inevitable contact of a lowly organism's epiblast and hypoblast with its surroundings, whether touched or tasted, virtually originates those rudimentary formations which gradually develop into the immense variety of external motors and sense-organs characteristic of more complex animals. Hence by a difference in the nature, temperature, transparency, motion, &c., of its environment, a gastrula or even a young foetus in the womb may develop new organic variations which virtually entitle it, when fully developed, to be called a new species of its own genus. Not only so, but what is doubly important from the mental side of the problem, the nature of an animal's intelligence, dependent as this intelligence wholly is on an animal's sense-organs and nervous system, must also be largely influenced in its evolution from a lower state by the kind of reciprocity developed between the primal epiblast and its environments.

An important factor in organic evolution, hitherto overlooked, is that common phenomenon, metamorphosis, characteristic to a greater or lesser extent of all organisms in the sub-kingdoms of the Vegetalia and Animalia. In the lowest fungi and algæ, a spore passes by "alternation of generation" through several moults before reproducing the parent type. In the Protozoa, Hydrozoa, Actinozoa, and Polyzoa, metamorphosis is general; the difference in appearance, organization and function in all the stages being equally as marked as in man's embryonic transformations. In insects, metamorphosis is universal. Among the crustaceans—the barnacle, acorn-shell, crab and lobster evince strange metamorphoses. The tadpole-stage of frogs is familiar to all, while the marsupials among the animals (kangaroo, opossum, &c.) produce their young imperfectly formed, and nurse them in pouches until fully developed. The significant fact for natural evolution in connection with these metamorphoses is, that reproduction does not occur in any of the intermediate stages, but only in the mature animal. For instance, the butterfly does not reproduce either in the caterpillar or the chrysalis state, but only when fully developed as a butterfly.¹ Similarly, in the series of metamorphoses through which we assume all primordial organisms were transmuted while developing from the ovule to the mature phase, no organism reproduced itself except the last.

Reproduction we thus allege to be the phenomenon which marks the completion of a generic organism, the end of its series of susceptible transformations beyond which, except in slight modifications of form and colour, whereby it is arbitrarily classed into different species or varieties, it cannot pass. Thus the amœba, by

¹ Metamorphological Selection.

undergoing fusion, and the volvox by copulating, never surmount the protozoic sub-kingdom, while the caterpillar and the tadpole, by not reproducing, metamorphose higher.

That primordial man, as well as the original ancestors of all the leading genera of animals, was also evolved by a series of moults or metamorphoses,¹ assisted and modified, more or less, by agencies which are described in current theories of selection—*i.e.*, Natural (Darwin), Physiological (G. J. Romanes), Colour (A. R. Wallace), and Embryological (Herbert Spencer), is thus not without circumstantial evidence. How long each took to develop, in this way, from its spontaneously-created ovule is, however, a subject for speculation. At present the human ovule grows into a babe in only nine months, but the embryo under present conditions of generation is developed in the best of circumstances, in a regular man-making machine, which works automatically, with only one thing to do, everything to hand, and the risk of modification by untoward environments reduced to a minimum.

Primordial man-evolution by metamorphosis, on the other hand, was bound to occupy more time, for we could hardly expect a human ovule spontaneously developed in a pond of water to metamorphose month by month through amœba, gastrula, fish, frog, mammal and monkey phases, and eventually to issue as a man-child in the ninth month, because the conditions were not suitable. Instead of being fed automatically, as a child is in the womb, the metamorphosing ovule would require to feed itself at every stage, unless, like the caterpillar, it ate enough at one stage to enable it to hibernate through another. Still, as even a new-born child is helpless and unfit, for years afterwards, to provide for itself, under the best of circumstances, we must infer that human evolution by metamorphosis was a slow process, that years were consumed in development, and that a comparatively adult stage was reached before the final moult scaled off, and man, in his finished form and complete reproductive functions, recognized his superiority to his brother the ape.

On the hypothesis of animals originating in and spreading only from one genital centre, a seeming difficulty (in higher animal evolution) arose from the fact of similar highly-complex plants and animals tenanted continents separated by deep seas. But Darwin ably met this objection by showing how eggs and seeds could be transmitted long distances by the agency of birds, floating trees, winds, currents, &c., while geology indicated great diversity in the pre-historic continents and seas of the earth.

On the hypothesis of spontaneous generation, the difficulty is still further lessened; for the time which ensued between the birth of the ovule and the appearance of the fully-developed reproducing animal, being passed, as much of it necessarily was passed, in water, would be sufficient to enable similar organisms to migrate thousands of miles

¹ Metamorphological Selection.

from one another; and the fact of their being subject to different climatic influences and material conditions during the various stages of their growth would cause them to evolve into different species of the same genus, even to become men of different colour, black, red, and yellow, or even with flattened noses and splayed feet.

From Embryology we learn that man's evolution from the gastrula stage in the womb is as follows:—After living as a sort of jelly-fish, and acquiring a skeleton or back-bone, he develops gill-like slits on each side of his neck, up to which the arteries run in arching branches as in a fish; while his heart is a single pulsating chamber like that of the lowest fishes. Next, he is a tadpole with branchiæ. At a later period he is a mammal with a movable tail considerably longer than the leg; while the great toe projects from the foot like the toes of adult apes. During the sixth month the whole body is thickly covered with fine wool-like hair, extending even over the face and ears, everywhere, indeed, save on the lower sides of the hands and feet, which are also bare in the adult form of the monkey. Only at a still later period does the embryo show signs of becoming a man instead of a gorilla.

Man's embryological development consequently indicates a rising scale of being evolved in the womb, paralleled by existing animal life as evolved by natural laws on the earth's surface. As the highest product of both evolutions is, in man's humble opinion, man himself, we naturally infer that the embryo stages of man's development but presents a condensed representation or panorama of what actually occurred in pre-historic ages, in man's gradual development from his spontaneously-produced ovule.

From the preceding argument we now proceed to speculate on the probable mode of man's actual evolution, correlating all the phases of amœbæ, jelly-fish, tadpoles, and apes, through which he passed before finishing his probation as a lower animal and becoming a human being.

In the evolution of the earth from its elementary substance (no matter what its sidereal parentage may have been), the forces in operation were, primarily, the same as are now, though perhaps differently manifested. The conditions of life were then favourable only to modes of action which produce minerals and crystals; for the high temperature of these early ages precluded organic existence. But as this igneous activity subsided, when water, soil, light, and heat were able to interact, and the protoplasmic elements, oxygen, hydrogen, carbon, nitrogen, &c., met in suitable proportions, these in their combinations brought about, at length, the production of the first simple organisms, protophyta, protozoa, and the lowest kinds of fungi and algæ. Further, if those formative conditions remained permanent and general, as at present, the spontaneous evolution of vegetal and animal germs would in turn occur by a

species of contagion ; all sorts of organisms sprouting contemporaneously ; not only protozoa, but the cells of future cœlenterata, mollusca, annulosa, and vertebrata, including the germs of fishes, amphibians, reptiles, birds, mammals, and even man.

In this medley of life, the germs of similar vegetable and animal genera would not be likely to originate contemporaneously in different localities ; this view is confirmed by the endemic nature of much of the world's flora and fauna. Hence the evolution of each well-marked genus of animals—say the lion, elephant, cat, dog, ape, and man—probably occurred in circumscribed areas of earth and nowhere else. Further, it is unlikely that Monogenism prevailed, that is, the evolution of solitary primordial germs of each animal genus ; but Polygenism, involving the evolution of many germs of cats, dogs, monkeys, and men, which all sprang contemporaneously from the primal protoplasm, and afterwards differentiated by metamorphological or other modes of selection into the numberless present species and varieties of each genus.

Man's first progenitors thus, probably, appeared on earth as spontaneously-produced protoplasmic cells or ovules, hundreds or thousands in number, developed from a flux of the chemical elements in some inlet of water. These cells, propelled by flagella or otherwise, grew first into protozoa, and fed on minute algæ. A further metamorphosis, primarily determined by the nature of their material constitution, but assisted accidentally by the nature and action of their environments, converted them first into gastrulæ, next into jelly-fishes, and then into vertebrates. In this state they probably migrated immense distances from one another along the shores of their natal sea, feeding on minute infusoria, &c., and subjecting themselves to different environments whereby different organic functions developed, until, on entering other inlets or rivers, they metamorphosed into amphibia, and browsed on herbs as well as algæ. Forsaking the water—their natural element—and in some stress of circumstances adopting a life on the land, they would next change into small mammals, develop a coat of hair, legs, and a tail, and vegetate on grass and herbs. Another metamorphosis converted them into the ape-form, in which state trees would be their home, and fruits and roots their diet. Lastly, on a final moult, they would discard their coat of hair, emerge as fully-developed men and women, with perfect sexual organs, and capable, for the first time during their long series of metamorphoses, of sexual union and the reproduction of their kind.

From this time multiplication would result by sexual intercourse, aided more or less by natural, sexual, physiological, and colour selections, use and disuse, &c., until the highly-differentiated European of to-day has now appeared upon the scene, the perfected product, so far, of all this progress and change.

A. DEWAR.

DRAMATIC RECITATION.

A REPLY TO MR. CLIFFORD HARRISON.

It is always interesting to hear a great artist discourse about his art ; and Mr. Clifford Harrison has attained to such eminence in his profession, that it is not surprising to find that his recent essay on the " Art of Recitation," in *Murray's Magazine*, has attracted much public attention. It is true that in the provinces and with popular audiences he is scarcely so great a favourite as Mr. Brandram ; but in London, and especially in London society, he occupies the pride of place among reciters, and there seems no likelihood of his being dethroned from his proud position. It is but natural, therefore, that not only his many admirers, but also all who are interested in elocution, should be eager to read what so great an exponent of the art has to say on the subject ; but those who anticipate much intellectual enjoyment from the perusal of Mr. Harrison's article will, it is to be feared, be disappointed, and Mr. Harrison's reputation will certainly not be enhanced by his latest essay in the field of literature. His capacity for writing the Queen's English is not equal to his really great abilities as a reciter ; and a fatal tendency to fine writing mars his style and frequently obscures his meaning.

It is, however, with the matter rather than with the manner of Mr. Harrison's article that I am at present concerned ; and here, while I admit that he makes many excellent points, and that many of his criticisms are just and many of his suggestions admirable, I find myself on the whole at variance with him.

In the first place, his twofold definition of recitation as dramatic or rhythmic will not bear investigation. There is a proper and an improper method of reciting, as there is of doing everything else. But " rhythmic declamation " is far too high-sounding and pretentious a term to apply to a mere sing-song delivery of verse ; and it is this faulty and monotonous method of utterance which Mr. Harrison designates as " rhythmic," and even recommends for occasional adoption. It is thus, he says, that " poetry has been and is read by the greater number of scholarly readers : " surely an unpardonable libel on the educated classes. It is quite true that those who are unacquainted with the laws of elocution are prone in declaiming verse to pay more

attention to the sound than the sense of the lines they are quoting, but it is certainly not true that persons of culture as a rule fall into the still greater fault of chanting when attempting to recite.

Mr. Harrison is at great pains to show that this disagreeable and irritating method of reciting is a survival of the most ancient way of intoning verse. Thus, he thinks, Homer would have rolled out the hexameters of the *Iliad*, thus the songs of the Provence minstrels were repeated, while even Shakespeare must have found the music of his love-sonnets "fall into this spoken song." For my own part I am prepared with a much simpler, and, I think, more plausible explanation. It is this—that the sing-song delivery of verse by an adult is merely the result of an evil habit contracted in childhood and never abandoned.

But while Mr. Harrison's definition of recitation is hardly likely to be generally accepted, it cannot be too strongly insisted that verse, whether blank or rhymed, must be delivered with due regard to the metre. The allurements of rhyme, the "jingling sounds of like endings," the rise and fall of the heroic measure, the lilt and swing of the anapæstic, and the merry trip of the trochaic metre, are all so many temptations to the reciter to let his voice fall into a monotonous chant. But this danger must not be avoided by delivering verse as if it were prose. The first duty of the reciter is to convey the author's meaning accurately and fully to the audience by the employment of judicious pauses and just and proper emphasis. But the music of the verse must be heard in the reciter's voice; and this effect can be produced without chanting or intoning, or adopting that sing-song utterance which Mr. Harrison calls "rhythmic declamation." Verse should be *spoken*; but, subject always to due regard for the meaning of the passage, the voice should rise and fall in answering cadence to its flow and ebb. This does not mean that every line should be scanned, but that in every line there should be a perceptible marking of the accented syllable of one or two feet, especially where the cesura occurs. To illustrate my meaning, take the following oft-quoted passage from Tennyson's *Guinevere*. Exquisitely musical as the lines are, they can be, as I once heard them, delivered as prose, if there be no marking of the feet, and if pauses of rather more than a comma's duration be introduced where the hyphens occur. Thus, "The children born of thee are—sword and fire—red ruin—and the breaking-up of laws—the craft of kindred—and the godless hosts of heathen, swarming o'er the Northern Sea." But let the voice rise where the accents occur as follow:

"The children born of thée are swórd and fire,
Red rúin, and the bréaking-up of láws,
The cráft of kindred and the góddless hosts
Of héáthen, swármíng o'er the Northern Sea,

and the full, rich music of the verse will be preserved, and a just emphasis laid on the most important words of the passage.

Poems written in the Spenserian stanza are the easiest to recite, because the ending of a line is frequently at the beginning or middle of a sentence, and the rhyming words often cannot be emphasized without obscuring the poet's meaning. Yet the rare sweet melody of the stanza is so audible, so clear, that all can hear it, and he indeed "hath no music in himself, nor is not moved with concord of sweet sounds" who in declaiming it cannot show without chanting, without falling into monotone, how

"The sweet Spenserian gathering as it flows,
Sweeps gently onwards to its dying close,
Where waves on waves in long succession pour
Till the ninth billow melts along the shore."

Shelley's poems again offer but few difficulties to the reciter, and for the same reasons. Moreover, the danger of adopting the sing-song method is minimized by the frequent employment by this most musical of poets of faint or imperfect rhymes. On the other hand, there are very few elocutionists who can repeat blank verse correctly. In this particular branch of his art the late John Ryder was, in his day, almost without a rival. His only competitor was Mr. Hermann Vezin, happily still spared to us. To hear this masterly elocutionist recite "The Seven Ages of Man" is a liberal education. The clear and resonant voice, the distinct utterance, the justness and propriety of the emphasis, the polished style, the dramatic power, evident but restrained, and the full expression given to the music of the verse—these are some of the prominent characteristics of a *tour de force* in recitation. But there is not in this a trace of what Mr. Harrison calls "rhythmic declamation" and I "sing-song." In fact, to hear Mr. Vezin or, let me add, Mr. Brandram, is to be convinced of the unsoundness of Mr. Harrison's views on this subject. Still, in order to declaim verse—and especially blank verse—correctly, it is not sufficient merely to listen to and observe these past-masters in elocution, for their method cannot be successfully imitated unless the reciter is intimately acquainted with the rules of prosody and the construction of the various metres adopted by English poets.

The next point on which I join issue with Mr. Clifford Harrison is his defence of musical accompaniments to recitation. He argues thus: "Music is complete in itself and does not actually need articulate words; but it has accepted poetry—and the two arts have formed one which we call singing. So declamation is complete in itself; but it can enrich and strengthen itself in like manner by accepting music. . . . And as in singing music is pre-eminent, so in this new recitative declamation must be pre-eminent." All this reads plausibly enough, but Mr. Harrison forgets that the combination of music and poetry—I use his own phraseology—has reached its highest development in singing; and any combination of the two arts which aims at a lower ideal than that already realized

is scarcely worth effecting. But Mr. Harrison claims all sorts of wonderful things for musical accompaniments, provided that they are, as he says, "significant of the drama," whatever that may mean. And here it should be noted that he uses the word "drama" in almost as many significations as Mark Twain, in his immortal chapter on "That awful German language," attributes to the word *Zug*. He uses such expressions as these: "the drama of the voice," "the drama of the words," "recitation placed on the grounds I have stated—that (*sic*) of drama," "where pathos or drama is the motive," "pieces magnificent in drama," &c. &c. It is not, therefore, easy to understand what he means by accompaniments "significant of the drama," unless the explanation is to be found in the assertion that "music gives to certain poems scenery, atmosphere, *background of emotion*" (the italics are mine), "and means of insight." Truly, Mr. Harrison is enthusiastic in praise of his favourite form of entertainment. Yet there cannot be among persons of culture many who share his enthusiasm. No doubt there are those who can feel no pity for Juliet's fate unless she dies to slow music: and too many managers and actors minister to the depraved tastes of these Philistines by employing this clap-trap device whenever a dramatic incident or "moving situation" occurs in a play. But to persons of refinement or dramatic instincts these meretricious artifices are altogether abominable.

And so of recitation. The reciter's duty is to bring home to the audience the full meaning of the author, and to enable them to realize vividly the situation he is describing or the character he is supposed to represent. For these purposes a musical accompaniment is absolutely useless to him. He may flatter himself that it gives to the poem a "background" or foreground "of emotion," or any other fantastic addition; but the principal effect on him personally, especially if he accompanies himself, will be to prevent him giving his full and undivided attention to the chief part of his work. Nor is it of any assistance to the audience. It throws no new light on the poem, and cannot, as Mr. Harrison claims, provide them with means of insight. It does not quicken their apprehension, but rather lulls it to rest; and at most it charms them into the lazy, dreamy rapture of the Lotos-eater.

But much as I dislike this form of entertainment, I fully admit that Mr. Harrison has done all that is possible, not merely to popularize it, but also to make it deserve popularity. His recitals "with music" have delighted thousands, and in his hands the combination never fails to evoke the enthusiasm of his audience. Yet there must be many who regret that so great an artist wastes his abilities on so poor a form of art,

Mr. Harrison laments that he is not a musician, for then "he might show how the combination might be achieved on a large scale."

Here he is far too modest. He is a thorough musician and a most admirable pianist. If he were not, his "accompanied recitations" would never have been popular. Indeed, it is scarcely too much to say that he owes his high reputation no less to his musical talent than to his exceptional elocutionary ability. The worst that can be urged against him is the agony the public suffer at the hands of the little band of "musical reciters" whom his success has induced to imitate his method. "On horror's head horrors accumulate." And alas! his article is a call for more recruits. He encourages others to follow his example by suggesting that with due care the combination of music and declamation "might be developed into a grand and most successful form of the art of recitation." Well might a critic in a daily paper recoil in horror from the "infinite possibilities of social torture" which this suggestion opens up to view. If even Mr. Harrison recites *Amphion* to a polka tune and heralds the appearance of an angel by sounding a chord in the bass, what unspeakable torments may not his followers, less gifted than he, inflict upon a long-suffering public! It is fervently to be prayed for that these mistaken imitators of the errors of a great artist may meet with all the discouragement they deserve.

The only combination of declamation and music which seems to be not only free from objection but worthy of praise, is to be found in such works as Mendelssohn's *Antigone* and *Œdipus at Colonus*. In these the choruses are sung by a choir, and the dialogue is recited without musical accompaniment, except in one or two lyrical passages. These latter I invariably recite in my natural voice, but I am not at all sure that the composer's intention was not that they should be delivered as recitative. But these accompanied passages are very brief and very few, and with these unimportant exceptions there is no accompaniment whatever to the recital.

One of the most vexed questions in regard to recitation is whether the reciter is justified in using illustrative action. Should he be a mere elocutionist relying for dramatic effect almost entirely on the rise and fall of the voice, varying intonation and inflection, and justness of emphasis, aided perhaps by appropriate facial expression, but only on rare occasions by "action" of any kind? Should he have recourse to gesture as freely as the actor? Or is there some *via media* in which the true solution of the difficulty is to be found?

Mr. Hermann Vezin would probably answer the first of these questions in the affirmative. In all his recitations as in those delivered by his pupils, the spectator cannot fail to notice the passive immobility of the limbs. No doubt this gives the impression of self-restraint, and is thus at times of the highest service to the reciter. But in stirring passages or in the relation of an exciting dramatic episode, it invests the whole performance with an air of tameness and unreality. There are times when the reciter, like the actor,

must, in stage parlance, "let himself go." Otherwise, despite a display of the highest elocutionary skill, the recital suffers from his apparent lack of spontaneity, and to good judges seems merely mechanical.

On the other hand, Mr. Clifford Harrison distinctly favours the use of gesture, but with limitations. "A reciter, I hold," he says, "should never actually change his place on the platform though he has often to give the effect of movement. I remember hearing Delaunay recite once. It was at a private party. In the excitement of the story he gradually moved halfway across the room; and when he ended his recitation he was some yards from the place where he stood at first. It gave me a curious sensation, as of a picture out of drawing. . . . I think it may be permissible to move slightly during a recitation if care is taken to return, naturally and unobtrusively, to the place where the reciter stood when he began. But even so, it (*sic*) should be rarely indulged in, for directly the reciter begins to move about, it seems as if he had gone beyond the limits of his art and was literally treading upon acting."

The rules here laid down are, I hold, for occasional observance only. The reciter, like the actor, must not shift his position without good reason, and an attitude of repose has often to be maintained throughout the delivery of a long poem. But the reciter, like the actor, may and should move about and move freely when by so doing he can heighten the illusion and give an air of reality to the imaginary scene he is depicting. In all dramatic situations, in all impersonations of character, he must not only "tread upon acting," but *act*. It would be interesting to know what Delaunay was reciting in the instance referred to above, but I doubt whether so great an actor would change his position without justification, and there are many cases in which a reciter would with advantage follow Delaunay's example.

Mr. Bellew's entertainments were called readings, because he always had on a table in front of him a book or manuscript of the words to which he occasionally referred. I once heard him recite a pathetic story in verse called *New Year's Eve*, in which a poor woman with her illegitimate child in her arms dies of cold and starvation outside the house of her betrayer while within he is feasting his friends. As soon as he had delivered the few introductory verses of the poem, Mr. Bellew stepped out from behind his table to the middle of the platform and there acted the part of the betrayed mother, walking to and fro now and again as if to keep out the cold, and using such gestures as a woman in like circumstances would. It was a bold and risky experiment; but it was eminently successful, and not merely because the impersonation was splendid.

but chiefly because Mr. Bellew adopted the true dramatic method, and thus enabled the audience to realize the whole scene.

I will take another example. Mr. Henry Irving is probably the worst elocutionist who ever attained to eminence in his profession. He produces his voice in a most unnatural manner and offends against every known law of elocution. Yet, if I were asked to indicate the finest example of recitation at the present day, I should certainly point to his rendering of the *Dream of Eugene Aram*. He acts throughout and changes his position as the action of the poem requires him, sometimes standing, sometimes sitting, sometimes moving about. He, too, adopts the dramatic method, and this enables him to seize hold of the spectator's imagination and to bring before it clearly and distinctly every detail of the murder and of the subsequent long agony of the haunted and soul-tortured murderer.

The reply I make to Mr. Clifford Harrison on this branch of the subject is to be found in these two examples. The reciter should adopt the actor's method, subject only to the restrictions which the absence of stage accessories imposes upon him. His is by far the more difficult art, for without the assistance of scenery, "make-up," or stage appliances, he must achieve all that the actor, who enjoys these advantages, accomplishes. He must make his audience forget their surroundings for a time and lead them with him into a world of fancy. And for these purposes he must draw on all the resources of the actor's art.

Nowhere is the adoption of the dramatic method more necessary than in the recital of a play. I always adopt it myself, but in *Macbeth* I endeavour to carry it out more completely than has yet been attempted. To the best of my ability I "act" each part, giving to each, as far as possible, distinct individuality by change of voice, gesture, and expression; and I employ every device I can to give an appearance of reality to the recital. By frequent change of position, by "taking the stage" where necessary, by indicating the position of each character supposed to be present, I seek to aid the spectators to picture the imaginary scene. Now this plan—I speak, of course, of that alone and not of my performance—is at least of great advantage to the reciter. It enables him to lose himself in his subject and thus to do his best, so that his work fills him with delight, whereas if he went through the play as if he were performing a mere elocutionary exercise he would bore himself and his audience. And I believe that, from the spectator's point of view, the plan is a good one. If it fail, the fault is in the reciter, not in the method.

Elocution is an art which offers many attractions to the student. It teaches him to avoid all slovenly modes of utterance and to speak

his mother tongue as it should be spoken. It increases the volume and flexibility of his voice and enables him to minister to the pleasure of others. Yet a mere knowledge of the rules of elocution will not make him a reciter, if he have not the gift of acting. The reciter must rely no less on the poetry of action than on the management of the voice. For him, too, as for the actor, Nature must be the guide, and he must faithfully follow her teaching. The danger of exaggeration threatens him on one side, the danger of tameness on the other. Between them lies the dramatic method which he must follow. For he must ever remember that the highest form of this delightful art is Dramatic Recitation.

F. E. MARSHALL STEELE.

HOME AFFAIRS.

THE Ministerialists and their Parliamentary allies are smarting under a run of ill-luck such as they have not experienced for a long time. In the recent bye-elections the voters have played them a scurvy turn, which they do not understand, and about which they are very sore-headed. The Unionist party, as we know, is not only superlatively good, it is superlatively wise. It contains all the talent. Day in and day out, we hear nothing but its praises, blown through its own trumpets. That the pre-eminently virtuous should be unkindly used is always a moving spectacle. It perplexes the most, as well as the least, philosophic among us, and especially the pre-eminently virtuous. The Unionists are astounded at what has befallen them. A formidable political combination, which has great names, much ability, immense funds, and enormous "territorial" influence; which professes to have in its sole keeping the honour of the British name, and to stand between the country and the greatest of all disasters, finds itself suffering defeat after defeat at the hands of the people whom it is most anxious to save. It is a remarkable fact, which should have its own special lessons for Unionists. That they will learn them is, however, doubtful. Nothing is more tenacious than self-delusion. And to ourselves, and those who think with us, there is no sufficient motive to spur us to the duty of saving the Tories and their friends from the fool's paradise into which they have committed themselves. We will only put to them these questions—Do you think, looking at the strength of your party combination, and the laborious efforts of three years' political work, you are making that progress which your efforts and ability ought to secure? And if not, why not? Further, what are the probabilities of the future, going upon the only safe ground of past experience?

The party of popular rights have reason for great encouragement in recent events. We write in advance of the Brighton election, which can hardly go in our favour. The polls at Sleaford, Peterborough, Elgin, and North Bucks, with the unopposed return of Mr. Leng for Dundee, are, however, ample justification of our postulate. The other day these constituencies sent to the House of Commons two Tories, one Unionist, and two Liberals—to-day they send one Tory and four Liberals. The transformation could hardly have been more complete. Mr. Chaplin was alone able to fight successfully for the

Government, of which he is now a member. It may be admitted that he did well, since he kept, and even improved, the majority which he had in 1885. He had the advantage which a well-known local man, who is also a popular landlord, must have over a comparative stranger like Mr. Otter, and for some inexplicable reason he had the help of his former opponent, whom we have heard described quite lately as a Gladstonian. It may be said, too, that the Government, being bound to see Mr. Chaplin through his re-election, made a superhuman effort to win. They sent down to the constituency their crack wire-pullers, and employed quite a host of astute electioneers in the duties which tell most effectually. The Unionists, who were not in existence in 1885, voted, of course, for Mr. Chaplin, and, as we had no compensating support from the Irish voters, who have yet to appear in Sleaford, the advantage was, of course, against us, but to what extent is doubtful. Mr. Chamberlain would, probably, decline to reckon his followers in Sleaford at seven, which is the number of votes Mr. Chaplin added to his 1885 majority. But, in proportion as any addition is made to the aforesaid seven, the Gladstonians are entitled to count increase in Sleaford. Still it is better, perhaps, to admit frankly that Mr. Chaplin remains master of the position in his own constituency, and that we have yet to begin the business of winning it for our own side.

Apart from Sleaford, we have a record of unqualified victory. At Peterborough, the return of Mr. Morton was a surprise even to the party-managers. At the previous election there was a Unionist majority of 289, and Mr. Morton not only wiped this out, but converted it into a majority for himself of 251. The Tories were dumb-founded. They had an excellent candidate in Mr. Purvis, and with a substantial majority (for Peterborough) in hand, they saw no difficulty in maintaining their hold on the seat. When the news arrived, they talked of avenging themselves in Elgin and Nairn, which was then just about to be polled. There had been differences between Mr. Seymour Keay, the Radical candidate (who is a disciple of Mr. Henry George), and his Committee, some of whom, with many of the voters, did not see their way to endorse the doctrine of the nationalization of the land. On the other side, the Unionists put into the field the strongest local man they could find, and, as there was against them at the last election but a small majority of 119 votes, they thought to put the unknown man and his "fads" to utter rout. It was considered to their advantage—though about that there may be difference of opinion—that Lord Hartington with the Duke of Fife (the latter a Banffshire man) should, in the height of the contest, appear together on a Unionist platform in Aberdeen; that Lord Hartington should speak two days later at Stirling, and that Lord Randolph Churchill should follow on the next day with a couple of political addresses at Perth. Yet,

with all this, Mr. Seymour Keay and his "fads" carried the day in Elgin and Nairn by 529 votes. And the Unionist and Tory poll was 172 greater than in 1886. There is no doubt at all that the allies were very sanguine about capturing a seat here. They have, or had, great hopes of Scotland as likely to give them in the next Parliament a good many Unionist Members. But their failure on this occasion, when all the circumstances were favourable to their cause, seems to put quite another complexion on the probable issue of affairs north of the Tweed. At Dundee previously, where a vacancy was created by the lamented death of Mr. J. B. Firth, the Unionists had thought it wise, after long consideration, not to put up a candidate, so that Mr. Leng, of the *Dundee Advertiser*, had a walk-over. Mr. Leng, unlike his brother, Sir W. Leng, of the *Sheffield Telegraph*, is an uncompromising Gladstonian.

Finally, the week which saw the polls for Peterborough and Elgin and Nairn brought us a crowning triumph in North Bucks. Since the division was created by the last Reform Bill, the seat has been alternately in the possession of two influential local families—the Verneys and the Hubbards. In 1885, Captain Verney (son of the well-known Sir Harry) won easily over the colonial millionaire—Sir Samuel Wilson, now the proprietor of Hughenden Manor; but in the year following he was defeated by seventy-one votes, and Mr. Hubbard sat a Tory. The accession of the latter to the peerage on the death of his father, Lord Addington, created the recent vacancy, and again Captain Verney and another member of the Hubbard family—a brother of the new peer—placed themselves before the electors. The contest was waged for a whole month. The Primrose Dames did wonders for Mr. Hubbard; and Mr. Chaplin, fresh from his victory at Sleaford, and now a fully-fledged Cabinet Minister, went down with swelling port—the *beau idéal* of a President of the Board of Agriculture. Towards the last, however, it became clear that the Tories were in distress. There are 600 out-voters in North Bucks, persons having qualifications elsewhere, and a notice was sent to the *Times* and the other metropolitan Tory papers, saying that the issue of the fight was absolutely in the hands of these gentlemen, whose presence on the polling-day was implored. It is not to be supposed that many of these out-voters failed to support Mr. Evelyn Hubbard, yet somehow or other the return showed that he was defeated by a majority of 208. It may be conceded that Captain Verney did not do anything like so well as he did in 1885; but, on the other hand, Mr. Evelyn Hubbard polled 200 more votes than his brother, and the victory was, in all the circumstances, sufficiently satisfactory. Taken with those which preceded it, it caused a profound impression throughout the country. There is no longer room for doubt as to the set of the current of public opinion. The cause of Ireland is winning its way

with the electors, in spite of everything. Of twelve seats which have changed hands during the life of this Parliament, the Gladstonians have captured eleven, which is equal to twenty-two additional votes on a division. And this is the result of the work of the formidable coalition which stands arrayed against us! If Mr. Gladstone needed anything to demonstrate his unparalleled capacity as a political leader, we have it here.

It is not surprising that the Unionist orators begin to sing in a minor key. Lord Hartington seeks to cheer himself and his friends by showing them how, even after a defeat at the General Election, they can impede the passing of a Home Rule Bill. Mr. Chamberlain, so cocksure of his own success as a rule, now says he will take his defeat "upstanding." And both he and Lord Hartington are at length condescending to return to the consideration of the practical details of Home Rule. They call aloud for the new scheme. It is unfair to them, they say, to keep them in the dark as to what is to be proposed by Mr. Gladstone, if he succeeds to power. Lord Hartington asks, Are the Irish Members to be retained at Westminster? And are they to have full power of voting as now? Then Mr. Chamberlain wants to know how the supremacy of the Imperial Parliament is to be secured, and what is to be done in regard to Ulster? The financial arrangements as between Great Britain and Ireland are equally matter of interest to him. As Sir William Harcourt puts it—they want to catechize us out of Home Rule. If the motive were less obvious, there would perhaps be more willingness to respond to the demands made. Mr. Gladstone has long ago agreed to the retention of the Irish Members, and of that Lord Hartington ought to be fully aware. We take it that they will come in the present number, and be allowed to vote as at present. Whatever we may be willing to do in setting up a subordinate Parliament in Dublin, we are none of us quite prepared for uprooting the British House of Commons. Those who talk loudest of creating a federal constitution for these islands admit as much. Their federalism is of the bastard sort. One can understand the federation of co-ordinate authorities, but to talk of a federal constitution to tie a subordinate legislature in Dublin and the Imperial Parliament is just a little absurd. If we ever arrive at the time when Wales and Scotland have their separate legislatures, and we have a subordinate authority for English affairs, working side by side with an Imperial Legislature at Westminster, we may begin talking of federation; but, before this, the House of Commons, as we know it, will cease to exist, and there is a long chance that the English people, whatever they may do for other folks, will prefer to stop short at the transmogrification of their own institutions. We are for retaining the Irish Members at Westminster in their present number, and with their present powers. Good feeling will probably dictate to them a large measure of abstention from matters which are

purely British ; but whether they vote on such matters or not, neither the craze for mere logical completeness, nor the wish for a pure Federalism, ought to induce us to set up two legislative bodies, the one subordinate to the other, in London. We are willing to make free confession that we were with Professor Freeman in preferring Mr. Gladstone's original Home Rule Bill, which removed the Irish representatives from the House of Commons ; but the country seems to have decided that, against their own wish, they must stay where they are, and we bow to that decision. To go further is, however, a different matter. We shall be interested to see how Mr. Gladstone deals with these various questions and suggestions. He is about to speak at Manchester, and it may happen that he will have something to say on certain of the points which have been raised.

Apart from their new study of the details of Home Rule, the Unionist leaders are really now casting about to find an alternative policy for coercion. At present they have not got far. Mr. Chamberlain, of course, still wants a measure for the wholesale creation of peasant proprietors, this being the one thing which, according to him, will kill the demand for Home Rule ; but having said again and again, in the plainest terms, that the Government were about to bring in such a Bill, he has latterly suggested that they should proceed by resolution, as Mr. Gladstone did in the case of the Irish Church. This, of course, means the postponement of the Bill for at least another year. To discuss the resolutions would probably be enough work for one Session. Lord Selborne is doubtful about the wisdom of wholesale land purchase, and has clearly not made up his mind to support any such scheme. Lord Hartington, however, talks vaguely, and with caution, of an intention to deal both with land purchase and local government in Ireland, and thinks the former may be approached next year. Mr. Courtney, being in a tight corner in Cornwall, seems genuinely anxious that something should be done for Ireland, and he wants the extension of local government first. The creation of county boards would, he sensibly says, give the best possible machinery for dealing with the land ; but he would take precautions against an abuse of powers, by giving the Executive authority to dissolve or suspend a board, just as there is now power to dismiss a board of guardians. All this is not very hopeful, even from the Unionist point of view ; and, when we look at the utterances of members of the Government, who really have the power to initiate a legislative programme, the promise of the future does not increase. Mr. Balfour is still sore-headed about the opposition which the Radicals gave to his Light Railways Bill, and he can speak to his constituents at Manchester a whole hour by the clock without saying a word more than this : " Ireland requires that he

material resources shall, by every means in our power, be expanded." We have plenty of the other thing—the vindication of the law, the protection of the minority, and the like; but of remedial legislation, nothing save the barren words just quoted. The Chief Secretary has even run away from a promise which he gave in the House of Commons a few hours before the Prorogation. He ventured to throw a boomerang, and the recoil has been too much for him. We are, however, destined to hear a good deal on this matter, and it may, consequently, be as well to put his language on record. Discussing the question of Irish University Education, Mr. Balfour regretted that the clergy had felt it their duty to discourage members of the Catholic Church from taking full advantage of the Queen's Colleges or of Trinity College, Dublin. But in these matters regrets were vain, and the only course was "to try to devise some scheme by which the wants of the Roman Catholic population should be met, other than those which at present had been attempted. He did not think it was proper on that occasion to suggest even the main lines of what the scheme ought to be; but that they ought, if possible, to carry out such a scheme, which would satisfy all the legitimate aspirations of Roman Catholics, he entertained no doubt." It is unnecessary now to describe the sensation which this declaration caused in the House of Commons and in the country. The Radicals threatened determined opposition, even at the risk of breaking up relations with the Irish party, and there were not wanting suggestions that Mr. Balfour was seeking to pay the price demanded for the Pope's Rescript on the Plan of Campaign. For a time, it seemed that Mr. Balfour had found the means of sowing dissension on the Opposition benches, and there was much quiet chuckling among the Ministerialists. Of course, everybody, without exception, took it for granted that the Government had determined to endow a Catholic University. When the Opposition speakers put the Government intention into this specific form, Mr. Balfour sat by without saying a word. The Ministerial prints the next day made the same assumption, and chortled in their joy over the 'cuteness of the Irish Secretary. But a very few days produced a change. The drum ecclesiastic began to resound in Presbyterian Scotland, and in Ulster—and the *Times* made plaintive confession that the scheme, which was to throw the Opposition into confusion, might destroy the Government. Meantime, however, Mr. Chamberlain had given in his adhesion to the further endowment of denominational education. Always ready to endorse the action of the Government, he declared that, as long as the Protestants of England claimed to retain their endowments, there was no reason why the Catholics of Ireland should not have help from the public funds! A more preposterous suggestion it is impossible to conceive, and that it should come from a leading member of the famous Birmingham League, which did so

much for unsectarian education, is another and painful reminder of the distance which Mr. Chamberlain has lately travelled the Tory way. More recently, he has put this question of University Education after the Land Question. Mr. Balfour has, however, no longer any keenness in regard to it. He was in Scotland when the Presbyteries were debating this matter, and he, no doubt, read what the Ulster Orange Lodges thought of his scheme. When the direct question was put to him by the Secretary of the Scotch Protestant Alliance—whether the Government were favourable to the creation of an Irish Catholic University out of national funds—he replied, “Though I desire to take steps to promote the higher university education of the Roman Catholic population, the foundation and endowment of a university for that purpose, as far as I am concerned, has never been in contemplation, and is not, in my opinion, necessary.” This is well enough as an answer to the question put, but we do not so much want to know what was *not* in Mr. Balfour’s mind, as what he really *had* in view. And clearly he offered a Government grant, in some shape or other, for the purpose named. It may be destined for a college or for the so-called “voluntary Catholic university” already in existence, but in either case the character of the thing is substantially the same, and the objection remains. Mr. Balfour’s conduct in this matter has been denounced by Mr. Gladstone as “the shabbiest of all the things which this shabby Government has been guilty of;” yet the Chief Secretary, usually so anxious to retort upon the Liberal leader, can appear before his constituents at Manchester, and refrain from saying a word. Meanwhile, the Irish party have given ample assurance that this question shall not be made a matter of dissension between them and their Radical allies, though they will hold Mr. Balfour to his promise to deal with the subject, as being a likely thing to bring the Government to grief. Clearly the child has been playing with the boomerang.

It is interesting to notice how, in other ways, the pressure of circumstances is telling on the Unionist factions. Mr. Chamberlain has lately been “running in and out,” to use a sporting phrase, with more than his habitual recklessness. At Birmingham he made a further appeal to the “Moderates” of the Liberal party to co-operate in removing such Irish grievances as afford a basis of common agreement; and at Huddersfield, some days later, he repeated the invitation. The very next day he was full of the idea of a great National party, which should include the best of the Gladstonians, and, of course, all the Unionist redeemed. When he was about to go to Newcastle-on-Tyne, the *Standard* told him to put aside his “superfluity of suggestion” as to the programme of next year’s legislation, and to define his terms in regard to the proposed National party. But Mr. Chamberlain had by this time lost his mellow mood. He “rapped” out in the old style; made a disgraceful personal attack

upon Sir G. Trevelyan, and then told the *Standard* that he should take no steps about the formation of a National party—that it was the duty of the larger fraction of the Unionists, the Tories, to lay down terms. The bye-elections followed, and when Mr. Chamberlain went into Devonshire and Cornwall he was still more bitter. He actually suggested that Mr. Gladstone bought support for his Home Rule Bill in 1886 by a distribution of peerages and baronetcies; that, consequently, he was as bad as Pitt himself, whose “blackguardism,” in forcing the Union upon Ireland, Mr. Gladstone has indirectly denounced. The same speech contained an accusation of wilful untruth against Sir William Harcourt, who has alone, of all the Liberal leaders, managed to maintain friendly relations with Mr. Chamberlain. Then, having said so much at Plymouth, he appeared at Bodmin to express his admiration for Mr. Gladstone. In this “he yielded to no man, though he would not use the language of servile adulation,” &c. Of all that Mr. Chamberlain has said since Parliament rose, perhaps nothing has given more serious offence than this last. Apart from this, one searches for his motives, and, with the best will in the world, can find no explanation for his vagaries, save that he is passing from a condition of hopefulness to that of doubt and apprehension. The future is certainly unlovely for him, and the *Standard* pointedly tells him, *à propos* of his numerous appeals to his old friends, that, if it is a mere question of getting terms that are acceptable to him before he goes back, his present allies will have to consider their own position in relation to him. A pretty case truly! Yet the *Standard* may be consoled. Mr. Chamberlain has cut himself hopelessly adrift from the Opposition; and it is his knowledge of this which gives such bitterness to his language towards the Gladstonians. But the Unionist orators all round are getting affected. Lord Hartington at Aberdeen delighted the *Times* by the aggressive character of his criticisms on Mr. Gladstone. The noble Marquis had the hardihood to say that Mr. Gladstone was no tactical leader; that he had thrice led his party to defeat, and the last time had “absolutely shattered it beyond all human probability or possibility of reconstruction.” *Ergo*, Mr. Gladstone was no longer entitled to the allegiance of the Liberal party. Lord Hartington seems to forget that he also had a share of responsibility on two of the three occasions alluded to. Again, he charges his old leader with inciting to insurrection in denouncing the moral authority of the Union—“he is approaching very closely to the limits, if he is not overstepping the limits, which ought to guide the conduct of a loyal subject of the Queen.” This sort of thing becomes infectious when it comes from a man of Lord Hartington’s position, and we trace a distinct increase of bitterness in political controversy since the oration at Aberdeen. Mr. Courtney, even, has “let himself go” in a way which we should have thought

impossible. We hope the temper will pass. The shadow of defeat does not warrant it, and it does not help to convince a popular audience. If Mr. Chamberlain had stood alone in this matter, there would have been little unusual in it—it is only because we find it extending all through the Unionist party that we are disposed to see in it a portent favourable to our cause. There is, however, another possible explanation of the rising temper of the Unionists, since the Home Secretary has told some of them to their faces at Birmingham that their chosen association with the Tories has “mellowed” them!

It is with this sort of prospect—a great access of bitterness in political controversy, and no certain promise of legislation for next year—that we confront the situation in Ireland. It is to be hoped that the Cabinet Councils which must soon commence will change the outlook. Mr. Goschen has been in Ireland for some weeks, but, it is said, he has been holiday-making and nothing else. Mr. Balfour is going to Dublin, or has just gone. But the materials for dealing with the more serious of Irish questions are already available, and it wants nothing but courage and determination to handle them with success. It is too early to speak with any sort of authority, but the suspicion grows that, spite of all we hear from the Unionists, the Government have not got beyond the series of Main Drainage Bills which have twice failed in the Commons. Their views on the Land Question are said to be limited at present to an extension of Lord Ashbourne's scheme, with certain modifications, and as to Local Government they have definitely promised only to consider the abolition of the Vice-royalty in “the interests of the Union.” Meantime, things are going in much the old way in Ireland. The new Lord-Lieutenant—the Unionist Earl of Zetland—has been sworn in, in succession to Lord Londonderry. It was, we suppose, according to custom, that, as soon as he had formally entered upon his Government, he returned to London, and went thence to Newmarket races! Lord Zetland has been congratulated upon taking office at a moment when the country is showing much improvement. There is, no doubt, a certain aspect of tranquility which Mr. Balfour puts down to his Crimes Bill, but which is probably much more due to the improvement of prices, and to the hope of better times which Mr. Gladstone's policy holds out to the Irish people. The quarrel between Mr. Smith-Barry and his Tipperary tenants continues. The steady determination of the tenants to resent the interference of their landlord in the affairs of the farmers on the Ponsonby Estate has brought down upon them the wrath of the Executive Government. The district around Tipperary has been proclaimed, and the authorities are now fully armed to suppress the holding of meetings and the like. We shall see if they venture to proclaim the County

Convention which is about to meet at Thurles to launch the Tenants' Defence League. Since the League was announced, a couple of months or more by Mr. William O'Brien, its constitution and regulations have been carefully framed so as to keep its operations within the law. As we shall hear a good deal of this new organization before long, it will be useful to state briefly what it is. Here is the official description:—

"The constitution of the League sets forth that it is founded to assist and maintain the rights of the tenant farmers of Ireland, now attacked by aggressive combinations of Irish landlords, and to protect their legal and equitable interest in their holdings by a defensive combination amongst themselves. The League is to counteract by legal means all combinations of landlords used to exact excessive rents and extort unjust arrears, to impose inequitable terms of purchase, or to stimulate evictions. To effect this, tenants are invited to join the new League, their contributions to be in fixed proportion to the Poor-law valuation of their holdings. Tenants on one or more estates combining and subscribing shall be entitled to the help of the League. In the event of emergency, the Council may vote the collection of a special levy, not to exceed the amount of the annual contribution. The League will afford legal advice to tenants in connection with proceedings threatened by any combination of landlords, or any landlord connected with such combination, and, in the event of eviction resulting from such proceedings, will afford tenants shelter and support, if they are willing to submit to arbitration the differences between themselves and their landlord. The affairs of the League will be directed by a council of 15, elected annually from the members. The subscription is to be not less than £1 per annum."

Mr. Parnell, in a letter excusing himself on the grounds of ill-health from attending the opening Convention, writes as follows:—

"I would advise that the working of the movement should be limited to defensive action, and that special regard should be paid to the following objects:—(1) The duty of protecting tenants from the landlord conspiracy, and who are prevented by this cause from availing themselves of the benefits intended by Parliament for the tenant's advantage; (2) the assertion of the rights of freedom of speech and public meeting, now so frequently and wantonly assailed by the horde of unscrupulous partisans who administer much of the executive and judicial function of the country; (3) the vindication of the same facilities for combination and organization which are secured to English working-men by the trades union enactments. These aims, governed and regulated by the rules and constitution, will, I think, sufficiently meet the crisis which has called the new organization into existence."

Before the League has been launched, it is accused of using the methods of the National League, and Mr. Smith-Barry has denounced it in the language which we should expect from him. For ourselves, we hope the League will adhere very closely to its particular aims and means. A careful examination of the constitution and rules does not inspire us with any great belief in the efficacy of the League as a protection against farmers from harshness and eviction. Successful combination against the landlords is an almost impossible thing *within the law*. The landlord is not in the position of an

employer, and cannot be "got at" in the same way. He has no running contracts to fulfil. Short of a wholesale surrender of farms, after due notice given, the chance of hitting his pocket in legal fashion does not very clearly appear; and how far such surrender is likely need not be discussed. But we shall be glad to find our doubts removed, since lawful combination is the one thing which can be safely recommended to the Irish peasantry, and we are extremely anxious that it should be effectively worked. Mr. William O'Brien went to gaol for the speech which announced the new League. His trial at Clonakilty has been described by a competent observer as "a wretched and miserable farce." The police short-hand writer made such a shocking exhibition of himself in the witness-box that the magistrates had to set aside his evidence. And it was actually established that the received reports of the speeches of Mr. O'Brien and of Mr. Gilhooly (who was tried with him) were handed back for additions by the District Inspector *after* he had been told by the Head-Constable that one of them was probably "cooked" from a newspaper. The charge against the defendants was one of conspiracy to "induce" the tenants of Mr. Smith-Barry not to pay rent. The prosecution relied mainly, as against Mr. O'Brien, upon two sentences extracted from a long speech, and quite outside its general drift, in which it was said: "The answer must not be here or in Cork Park, but in their (the landlords') own rent offices;"—and "I won't say never to pay rent to them until it is wrung out of you at the point of the bayonet, for I am told that would be a breach of the Crimes Act." As to Mr. Gilhooly, there was nothing to connect him with this language, as we are told, save "a few broken sentences, as to the compilation of which the gravest suspicion rested." For it must be remembered that, the evidence of the short-hand writer being excluded, there was only such proof as could be tendered by policemen who took the speeches in long-hand. And upon the character of this proof a very serious argument was addressed to the Bench by counsel for the defendants. But the magistrates had no difficulty. They believed generally the evidence of the long-hand police reporters, and incidentally endorsed the action of the Inspector in directing an addition to their reports. Mr. O'Brien was accordingly sentenced to two months' imprisonment, and ordered to enter into recognizances to be of good behaviour during a further like period; whilst Mr. Gilhooly's term was fixed at six weeks, also with an additional two months in default of entering into recognizances. As Mr. O'Brien declined to appeal, he was taken straight to gaol—(the police had a special train waiting, they were so sure of their prey)—and he is about completing his first term. Mr. Gilhooly is to appeal; and, if the Quarter Sessions does not quash the decision in his case, we shall be surprised, though surprise is not easily aroused now-a-days by anything done in Ireland. Nobody seems to

think much of the fact that not a single Catholic was allowed to get upon the jury which has begun the trial of the persons accused of the murder of Inspector Martin at Gweedore. Here the Crown has thrown wide the net, so as to bring into an indictment for conspiracy Father McFadden and some twelve other persons, whilst ten men stand accused of the capital crime. And the trial is proceeding at Maryborough, in Queen's County, some 120 miles from the scene of the tragedy. To complete the narrative of events since last we wrote, it is necessary to say that the police have, in two separate cases, fired upon the people, killing a man each time. In one case, at Tipperary, the coroner's jury have found a verdict of wilful murder against the constable who fired the fatal shot, and against the inspector who gave the order to fire; and they will have to stand their trial, unless the Government successfully move the superior courts to quash the verdict. In the other case, the jury disagreed. The defence in each case was, of course, that the police fired to preserve their own lives.

Before leaving the purely political part of our subject, a word ought, perhaps, to be said concerning the doings of our own friends in Wales and in Scotland. Welsh politics are becoming very prominent. The Celtic pulse is just now as high on this side the Irish Channel as on the other. The other day, the North Wales Liberal Federation and the Welsh National Council met at Carnarvon for their annual conferences. The North Wales Federation is accused by the Southerners of being lukewarm and inefficient, and in the National Council a motion was made to abolish both the Federations (North and South) and the National Council, and to set up in place of the three, a National League for Wales. This National League should (so it was said) take up certain burning "national" questions—Home Rule for Wales, Disestablishment, the Tithe Question, and the like. It should issue its mandate to Members of Parliament, and, if a Member of Parliament failed in any particular, the branches of the League, which had jurisdiction within his constituency, should bring him to book. This proposal found considerable support in the National Council, and, although it was defeated, the question of improving the party organization was referred to a committee. The North Wales Federation, having had the advantage of this lecture, was naturally in its turn a little more aggressive than usual. Complaint was made of the attitude of Mr. Gladstone on the question of Disestablishment, and an unlucky phrase, in which the right honourable gentleman alluded to the Welsh as a flock of sheep, was seized upon to urge the despatch of an address to him, saying that, upon this question of the Disestablishment of the Church, "the Welsh would be sheep no longer." An address "in courteous terms" was unanimously voted. Sir William Harcourt addressed the National Council during the day, and in the evening there was a mass meeting at which Sir William, fresh from an interview with

Mr. Gladstone at Hawarden, pronounced the doom of the Welsh Establishment. "The time has come when the Establishment in Wales must cease to exist," he declared, to the huge delight and satisfaction of his audience. Hence the address to Mr. Gladstone was a little superfluous. Our Welsh friends are, indeed, altogether a little "previous." They do not seem to ask themselves if the conditions do not at present prohibit the realization of their aims. We want a Liberal majority before we can help them to what they seek. The political combination which is dominant at Westminster has recently declared, through Lord R. Churchill, at Machynlleth, that the maintenance of the Established Church, "whether in Wales, Scotland, or in England," is a fundamental part of the Tory creed. And the Tory creed is, as we know, the Liberal-Unionist creed, since the allies are bound to stick together on a vital question. If we might venture on a bit of friendly advice, we would say that the Welsh Liberals would do well to drop the foolish talk about a Welsh National League. We are not particularly frightened by names, but *the* National League, like its predecessor, the Land League, was the creation of abnormal circumstances, and was only justifiable because of those circumstances. There is no such work to do in Wales as there was and is in Ireland, and, to our minds, Welsh necessities will be fully served by perfecting the existing party organization. As for Mr. Gladstone, he has never lagged much behind his party, and, when the hour comes when action is possible, we venture to affirm that he will not fail. It ought to be some satisfaction to Wales that the Liberal leaders have now, through Sir William Harcourt, also agreed to the application of the tithe for the purpose of free education. This was another announcement in the Carnarvon speech which must be taken to have emanated direct from Hawarden; so that it would appear that clauses dealing with tithe, in this sense, will be part of any Bill which the Liberal party may hereafter bring forward for the Disestablishment of the Anglican Church in Wales. One word only as to Scotch politics. The Marquis of Bute has declared himself in favour of Home Rule for Scotland, to the great surprise of his numerous Unionist friends. As Lord Bute owns some 90,000 acres of land in Scotland, it cannot be said of him that he has no interest in the political experiment which he advocates.

The interval since we last wrote has seen some important social and trade movements. The London Dock strike, the effort to combine the working-women of the East End, and the later action of the tramway and omnibus *employés*, have all found strong public sympathy. The pressure put upon the dock companies was irresistible; and, spite of their protests that there was an unlimited supply of labour at existing prices, and that their dividends would be swept away, they were compelled to concede the whole of the men's demands. It must be said that the men behaved splendidly, and that they were

splendidly led by Mr. John Burns and others. Money poured into the leaders of the strike, and, with £40,000 at the bank, they were able to "stiffen the backs" of the men until victory was assured. And it is pretty plain already that public opinion is for seeing the tramway and omnibus men through their trouble. That men should be called upon to work sixteen or seventeen hours a day is as repugnant to the public conscience as it was to hear that the dock labourer was compelled to work for 5*d.* an hour, just as "the ganger" might want him. We seem, as a people, to be setting up a new code of social and political ethics, in which the old political economy is being driven to the wall. It has been laid down in the recent contests between labour and capital, that, whatever happens to capital, labour, at any rate, must be decently paid, and must not be over-worked. It is, however, clear that capital must find its return, and the ultimate issue of any such change will be a general rise of prices. The sympathetic public, having called the tune, will have to pay the piper. It is most just. And thus will political economy be avenged.

The autumnal congresses have been less interesting than aforetime. At Dundee, the Trades Unions again made a sturdy stand against the insidious attempt to lead them into the movement for a Parliamentary Bill which shall establish for adult males, as for women and children, an eight hours' working-day. Of 885,000 members in union, only 102,000 voted in the *plébiscite*, and of these only 39,629 were for a Parliamentary Bill. Nobody, of course, has anything to say against a voluntary arrangement. At the same time, we do not believe in its practicability. That any sane artisan, in good bodily health, will be content in these times to throw away the opportunity of making extra money by any reasonable exertion is inconceivable. We were not surprised to find that, at the recent miners' conference at Birmingham, there was a strong division of opinion about an eight hours' Parliamentary working-day. We shall be curious to see the result of the ballot which is about to be taken. Yet it is here that one would willingly make an exception if there were a unanimous demand, since the conditions of labour in mines are so abnormal that they have already been matter of frequent Parliamentary interference.

The Newcastle-on-Tyne meeting of the British Association was extremely dull and unfruitful, and the suggestion has been widely made since that the Association has lost its hold upon the leading men of science, who do not relish the incursion of the ancient bores of the Social Science Congress. The President this year was Professor Flower, of the Natural History Museum, South Kensington. With his immense knowledge of biology, the Professor declared that the true attitude towards the Darwinian theory should be that of a suspense of judgment. At the Church Congress held at Cardiff, the

position of the Welsh Church was, of course, much in question. It was claimed by the Bishop of Llandaff that the Church had a third of the people who went to places of worship, and that she was at the head of the denominations. His lordship dealt roughly with Mr. Osborne Morgan, and Mr. William Abraham, M.P., as he has since dealt with Sir William Harcourt, for his speech at Carnarvon. The new Bishop of St. Asaph was, of course, equally aggressive, and, what is more, both he and the Dean of St. Asaph made equal pretensions as to their position and numbers. And a good deal was made of the alleged fact brought out by a Mr. Llewellyn, that, in the General Election of 1885, when Disestablishment was a prominent question, 98,593 persons voted for, and 67,260 against—the proportion being about 3 to 2. The explanation is simple—in certain of the large towns of Wales, such as Cardiff, the Tories play a very strong hand at election times, and thus they count. But in rural Wales they are in a feeble minority. The Congress was more interesting on its spiritual side. The greatest favour was shown to the proposal (originated in the Convocation of Canterbury by Archdeacon Farrar) for the revival of religious brotherhoods, and Mr. E. Terry, the comedian, had a large audience while he pleaded with the parsons to mend—not to end—the theatre. At present they condemned it because they knew nothing of it; let them support the theatre, and undertake its reform, enlightened by knowledge. Then the new Bishop of Bedford, who has since been so prominent in the trade troubles of the East End, pleaded for toleration of dancing. There never were, he said, such dancers as the East-enders, and, whilst dancing, at any rate, there were no better-conducted people. It was when the Congress got back to a proposal to touch the privileges of the Church, that the war spirit broke out afresh. On the subject of "Home Reunion," the Dean of Peterborough pleaded hard for a relaxation of the doctrine of apostolic succession, that Nonconformist ministers might take part in the celebration of the communion, and the like. But the Dean was alone, and immediately the zealots fell upon him with the cry of "no surrender," "no dallying here," &c. It was a painful sight, the more that, quite recently, the Lambeth Conference made an appeal to the orthodox free churches to come into union. Unfortunately, the bishops stuck for the recognition of "the historic episcopate," and on this rock, more particularly, their well-intentioned scheme miscarried. The Congregationalists and the Baptists alike found acceptance of the overtures impossible without self-stultification—hence they politely declined to take action.



HOME RULE FOR SCOTLAND.

It is a familiar taunt against the Liberal Party that the proposal to grant Home Rule to Ireland is not the outcome of honest conviction, but is, at bottom, a Counsel of Despair. The feeling has gradually grown, it is said, that the gruesome tragedy of *Coercion*, in 87 acts, played in turn by both political parties, cannot possibly be continued. It has hitherto signally failed to terrify the Irish people, just as the reluctantly granted reforms of recent years, too late to have any graciousness left in them, have equally failed to conciliate them. We had better give the thing up as a bad job, wash our hands of the entire concern; grant Home Rule to Ireland, not because we have any real hope that it will permanently benefit that unhappy people, but that we Britons are sick of the whole business, and heartily glad to get rid of it.

If this were a correct account, and not a ghastly caricature of Liberal thought and feeling, it would be hopeless to persuade any patriotic Scotsman that Home Rule would be any boon to his native land. Without going the length of saying that Scotland is already ripe for Home Rule—for there are always a number of patient people who will persist in believing that blood may be extracted from a stone, if you only wait long enough—still it will not be difficult to demonstrate that, if Scotland had only possessed her national Parliament, reformed as it would certainly have been, much of the unhappy strife and division that have occurred in that country might have been prevented; many of the long-delayed and at last grudgingly granted reforms would have been carried years before, and there would now be a more hopeful outlook with regard to those Scottish questions that await solution in the immediate future.

One very farcical point must be disposed of at this early stage. There has been a good deal of discussion lately as to the various political and economic causes to which during the past half-century we owe our national and commercial prosperity. Some plead for the application of steam and the extension of railways; many for free trade; others, again, the introduction of machinery into manufactures; others our mineral resources—the extensive stores of coal and iron found together.

It seems never to have occurred to those purblind students of history that quite another cause was in operation, more potent than

all these pigmy sources taken together. It has recently been discovered that Scotland owes all her share of prosperity to the Parliamentary Union with England of the year 1707.¹

Can you suppose for a moment that, if the Scottish Parliament continued to assemble in Edinburgh, there would now be a single ship in the Clyde bigger than a fishing-smack? Can you doubt but that the foundries of Lanarkshire would never have lit up their watch-fires, the factories of Fifeshire and Dundee would have been silent, and the busy looms of Paisley dumb? Where, then, would have been the trade in Highland whisky, Aberdeen haddies, and Dundee marmalade?

A century later, Ireland was, by hook and by crook, induced to send her members of Parliament to London, but unalloyed prosperity has hardly followed in their train. Scotland, it is alleged, prospered by reason of its parliamentary alliance with a richer country; and, strange to tell, England also prospered by having a poor and ragged relation tacked on to her. There is a missing link about this reasoning. It certainly takes "the shine" out of Tenterden Steeple and the Goodwin Sands.

It is rather a curious fact, which proves the truth of the Tory maxim, how rarely people know what is good for them, but the Parliamentary Union, when proposed, was very unpopular in Scotland, and helped to foster a spirit of discontent that lent strength to the memorable rebellions which broke out not many years later, in 1715 and 1745. The Scottish people naturally feared that their Protestant Faith and Republican Church government would suffer by contact with, as they reckoned it, the semi-Papist, semi-Rationalist religion then prevalent in the Church of England, with its priestly caste and prelatic tyranny. A special clause was solemnly inserted in the Treaty of Union to secure the freedom of the Church of Scotland from external interference; but this parchment security proved useless in preventing a succession of calamities. The Scottish people found it much easier to relinquish their religious and political liberties than to recover them.

They also feared, and not without sufficient reason, as events afterwards showed, that the Scottish system of jurisprudence, constructed on the principles of Roman law, the envy and admiration of jurists and students of every nation, might, with an Imperial Parliament, be transferred into the chaos which English Law has been allowed to become, and from which it has not even yet emerged, making codification well-nigh impossible. An admirable motto for the Imperial Parliament, worthy of being carved over its most prominent portal, would be—"Mangling done here."

It cannot for a moment be contested that the Scottish people have

¹ See the speeches of Mr. Finlay, M.P. for Inverness, and Mr. Raleigh, candidate for one of the Divisions of Edinburgh.

suffered anything like the heaped-up injustice and brutal tyranny to which their brother Celts were subjected in Ireland, and that for a very sufficient reason. Scotsmen would not have quietly submitted to such brutality for a single day. Their oppressors would soon have discovered that the old spirit of Scottish independence was neither dead nor sleeping. The heather would soon be ablaze, and the fiery torch, carried from hill to hill, would rouse both Lowland Scot and Highland clansman. Forgetting their old feuds and ancient jealousy, they would stand shoulder to shoulder in the face of foreign tyranny and oppression.

The old Scots' Parliament that assembled in Edinburgh was peculiarly constituted. The Peers and Representative Members sat, spoke, and voted in one chamber. If there must be two orders in our legislative body, which is very doubtful indeed, this is certainly the most useful and least mischievous way; in avoiding the waste of time, and temper, and friction of our double-chamber system with its double discussion, as well as the frequent risks of dead-lock. If the new Home Rule Parliaments are to have a second chamber, as Mr. Gladstone suggested for Ireland solely as a concession to the timidity of his opponents, each Nationality ought, after a fair trial, to be empowered to reform itself, by ending or mending it. As was the case in all representative institutions at that time, the Members of the Edinburgh Parliament were elected by only a fraction of the people, and were distributed with no regard to the requirements of the population. Still, it contained the elements of a better system; and there can be no doubt that, with the intelligence and keen interest which Scotsmen have always shown in their national affairs, the broadening and deepening of the franchise would have come in time, long before it was granted in the timid and piecemeal fashion which has prevailed in the Imperial Parliament at Westminster. Such was the capable instrument of legislative liberty which the Scottish people in 1707 allowed to be deliberately flung away.

Scotland had not long to wait before events occurred to deepen her dissatisfaction with the new state of things, and to make her regret the fatal blunder of parting with her Parliamentary Independence. At the Revolution Settlement in 1690, the English prayer-book which had been thrust at the point of the bayonet upon the Scottish people, the Prelatic government and Royal supremacy in the Church of Scotland, and appointment by Patronage that accompanied them, were all abolished. William of Orange, besides being a tolerant and liberally minded man, was astute enough to see the necessity of strengthening his own position by conciliating the Scottish people, and by putting a stop to the religious persecution. But in 1712, only five short years after the Treaty of Union, the advisers of his successor, Queen Anne, having no genuine sym-

pathy with the Republican government of the Presbyterian Church, and in spite of the most solemn obligation to defend her liberties, restored Patronage to the Church of Scotland, in the hope that her ministers might cease to be the free leaders of the Scottish people, and become, instead, dependent on the favours of the aristocracy and the Court, by which, from that time forth, they were appointed.

Had Scotland only retained her Parliamentary Independence, this invasion of the cherished rights of the Christian people would have been morally impossible. What could her 45 members, as they then numbered, even when united, do, lost in the herd of English representatives at Westminster, who could hardly be blamed for neither appreciating nor understanding this claim for the liberty of the Scottish Church, with which, in their own, they were quite unfamiliar?

Scotsmen do not need to be told that, from this breach of solemn obligations, entered into only five years before, all the religious strife and bitterness, the ecclesiastical jealousy and contention have sprung, which have ever since been so dark a blot on Scottish Christianity—under the reign of Patronage, what is known in Scotland as the age of Moderatism set in with its cold and chilling rationalism; a time when religious zeal and fanaticism were reckoned synonymous, and piety and earnestness vulgar and ignoble things. The Scottish Aristocrats, who had mostly forsaken the Church of their fathers and shared none of the pious sympathies of the people, along with the Ministers of the Crown, whose sympathies may even be said to be less, now became the patrons to all parishes and preferments in the Church of Scotland. It was not very wonderful that nearly all the piety and worth of the “Auld Kirk” should leave it in a sad series of Secessions, beginning as early as 1733, and culminating in the memorable Free Church Disruption of 1843.

The Scottish people were deeply stirred by these events, especially during the “Ten Years’ Conflict” which immediately preceded the great Disruption. Many of their Parliamentary representatives at Westminster, notwithstanding the restricted franchise of that day, were faithful and true; but what were they among so many? Just three years before, in 1840, Dr. Chalmers had lectured in London in defence of Church Establishments, his remarkable eloquence being the sensation of the time. Peers, Bishops, Archbishops, and all sorts of aristocratic and ecclesiastical dignitaries sat in mute admiration at his feet, and made him the fashionable lion of the day. It is very pathetic to recall the very same reverend doctor, just three years later, interviewing his old friends and patrons, pleading this time, not for “the loaves and fishes,” but for Church Independence, and coming empty away. They could not understand this old man eloquent—“The Liberty of the Church and the Rights of the Christian people! Bless me, what can the man mean? The Church

of England has got on very well without them all these many years, and what more liberty can any Church want?" Poor old Chalmers returned from his mission to Westminster with a heavy heart. He tried the Whigs; he tried the Tories; he tried Churchmen; he tried Dissenters—and, with very few exceptions, all in vain. So utterly ignorant were the English people of the calamity about to burst upon Scotland, that the notorious Dr. Cumming had no difficulty in persuading Lord Aberdeen, Prime Minister of the time, worthy Scotsman notwithstanding, that the vaunted Disruption would consist of six or eight extreme men who had gone too far to turn back again.

The memorable march on the 18th of May, 1843, from St. Andrew's Church in Edinburgh, has furnished many a picture for artistic pen and pencil; but what strikes us most in that grand procession is not so much the venerable leaders, although they were well worth looking at—men like Welsh, Gordon, and Chalmers,—nor yet the younger men, Cunningham, Candlish, Guthrie, and Begg, who so nobly succeeded them: what interests us most are those in the rank and file who take up the rear in that long line of more than 400 faithful ministers; the obscure middle-aged men from country parish and Highland glen, without the confidence of great abilities, and lacking the high enthusiasm of youth; men with a good conscience, and yet a trembling heart, for by the solemn act of that hour they could not forget that they had for ever forfeited the right to sleep another night in the dear old manse among the hills, and that their wives and children were homeless, having literally nowhere to lay their heads. The contention is, that, with a National Parliament in Edinburgh, this scene—grand, no doubt, yet saddening,—and all the mischief that followed in its train, would never have happened. We want to know why Scotsmen, whether as Churchmen or citizens, should have to go a-begging for their liberties at any man's door? There cannot be the shadow of a doubt that, dissociated from English political parties and the burning questions of the hour, the "Ten Years' Conflict" might have lasted longer or been settled sooner, but the Disruption would have been a moral impossibility.

Scotsmen are so accustomed to recall with pardonable pride this splendid spectacle of self-sacrifice for conscience' sake, that they are apt to forget the grim shadow of evil that accompanied the Disruption, together with the sectarian bitterness, the unholy envy, the jealousy, malice, and all uncharitableness which religious strife and ecclesiastical contention never fail to generate. The rapid growth, about this time, of many cities and large towns, left ample room for Church extension with little friction. In small and decaying towns, in villages, hamlets, and country parishes, where, from various causes, the population was diminishing, two churches, and sometimes three, were planted in almost every parish, not at the extremities, but often side by side, where one church would have furnished ample accommo-

dition for the few and scattered worshippers. These were the cases—and they were numerous—where the bitterness and ill-feeling were aroused, so unworthy of the religion they all professed. It has been stated on trustworthy authority that the religion of Scotland would be healthier and purer if its people should wake up some fine Sunday morning and find half their churches in flames.

By the abolition of its National Parliament, Scotland for the first time reaped the unspeakable advantage of having the House of Lords in its legislative capacity to revise all measures that had run the gauntlet of the British House of Commons, and, in its judicial capacity, to decide Scottish appeals. The number of Scottish measures that owe their early death or painful mutilation to the possession of this priceless privilege is something fearful to contemplate.

The cases of abuse arising out of the appellate jurisdiction of the House of Lords may, at first sight, seem only to concern a very limited number of people, but it must be remembered that each unwise decision bears far-reaching results. It stands to reason that, in cases where the Scots' law differs from the English, the Judges of Appeal, bred in a system in many respects radically different, and revising a judgment quite foreign to many of their usages, however desirous of being impartial, should, from pardonable ignorance and want of sympathy, be frequently led astray.

It is very fortunate both for English and Scottish law that the appeals carried to the House of Lords from Scotland are very few and far between, otherwise the defective constitution of the Supreme Court of Appeal would become an unbearable anomaly. Of recent years, a Scottish judge has been appointed to keep the others right in matters concerning which, it is to be feared, they stand in happy ignorance. These are a few of the mercies for which we are asked to be truly thankful.

Leaving ecclesiastical and judicial affairs, we will now advert to an important commercial matter in which Scotland has suffered by parliamentary association with England. In 1845, restrictions were for the first time imposed on the free rights of banking and currency previously enjoyed in Scotland for nearly two hundred years. Banking and note-issue had got into a very bad way in England, the inevitable result of the prevalence of privilege and monopoly, and the absence of that freedom without which no institution can ever become strong. National and Provincial Joint-stock Banks, such as had flourished in Scotland for many years, were for a long time forbidden in England, and private banks only permitted, with few partners, whose business could only be carried on with very limited resources, and on a local scale. The result was, as might have been anticipated, that banking and note-issue in England fell into the hands of all sorts of petty tradesmen. Village grocers, drapers, and

cheesemongers kept a banking department, and issued their own bank-notes. No wonder that banking became a bye-word and reproach, and that the notes issued upon such slender resources became depreciated and degraded. Scores of such bankers stopped payment under the slightest provocation, and hundreds failed in every commercial panic.

Freedom fortunately saved Scotland from such miserable weakness and the dissipation of its forces. Although always a much poorer country than England—poorer in soil and more uncertain in climate—poorer in capital, in commerce, and manufactures—yet such elements of financial strength as it possessed were carefully gathered up and slowly built into a number of powerful banking institutions, nearly all of a national character. Butchers, bakers, and candlestick-makers had the same liberty to open banks and issue notes in Scotland as in England, but so thoroughly did the branches of the great National and Provincial Banks penetrate into every creek and corner of the country, that, without either privilege or monopoly, but simply by natural selection and the survival of the fittest, such paltry rivalry as existed in England became impossible. The strength and stability and united solidarity of the Scottish Banks enabled them to bear successfully the severe strain of several times of panic and pressure, when so many of their weaker brethren in England went to the wall, and when even the Bank of England, with its immense resources and all its privilege and monopoly, was only able to stave off bankruptcy by repeated suspensions of payment.

This was the happy condition of affairs that Peel's Act of 1845 brought to an end. Long before this time, when the issue of one-pound notes was forbidden in England, Scotland would have shared in the same calamity but for the powerful agitation led by that stout old Tory, Sir Walter Scott, who, under the graphic *nom-de-plume* of "Malachi Malagrowther," gave effective voice to the complaints of his countrymen. Attempts were not wanting in 1845 to suppress these abominable one-pound notes, but were wisely abandoned, although restrictions on the right of issue, and a mischievous provision, which practically prevents the establishment of any new Bank in Scotland, however influential its supporters, and however rich in resources, were imposed. The Scottish Banks cannot be fairly charged with abusing this practical monopoly, but the temptation ought to be placed beyond their reach.

One of the ridiculous results in Scotland of Peel's Act is that, owing to the unfamiliarity of country folks with the use of cheques, there is at each half-yearly term, when rents and other periodical payments are made, a great expansion of the Note circulation. In order to comply with the provisions of the Act, great boxes of sovereigns are carted from the Bank of England to Edinburgh and Glasgow, where they remain unopened for a few weeks until the surplus notes return, when they are carted back again to London, of

no more real use than if they contained not bullion, but bricks. Quite recently, repeated attempts have been made, on the occasion of the Scottish Banks coming to London, and, again, when they desired to adopt the Limited Liability Act, to induce them to barter away what is left of their ancient liberties.

Whether the Scottish people have the same interest now in defending the practical monopoly of these institutions as formerly is not so certain, seeing that these Banks are no longer satisfied with being Scottish National Institutions. The fear is not unreasonable that the strong financial attraction towards the Metropolis may tend to the impoverishment and neglect of commercial and industrial enterprise in the outlying Scottish provinces. There is undoubtedly a risk of a new race of directors arising who may forget the humble origin, and the purpose for which these Banks were instituted, whose only anxiety will be to earn high dividends, preferring big loans of £50,000 to London bill-brokers and jobbers on the Stock Exchange to such paltry business as £50 bills for the fishermen of Buckie and the Highland farmers of Lochbroom.

With a Home Rule Parliament, the Banking Act of 1845, with its restrictions—some positively mischievous and others absurd—would never have been passed.

No one who knew the state of public opinion in Scotland can doubt that the various proposals to extend the Parliamentary Franchise, which had to be agitated and argued for years before they were successfully carried in the Imperial Parliament, would long before have passed in a Scottish National Assembly, with all the accelerated progress that would be possible during those weary wasted years.

It is a poor sign of the political intelligence of a people who require either famine, or pestilence, riot, or revolt to awaken them to a consciousness of the dire results of blind neglect or heartless indifference. England, timid, Tory, and impervious to rational argument, as she has nearly always been, might have been induced at a much earlier period, by the practical demonstration of the safety and value of Household Suffrage in Scotland, to take that famous leap no longer in the dark.

There is no single matter in which the loss of its National Parliament has caused such deep and widespread damage to the Scottish people as that of Popular Education. The delay and difficulties and objections that were raised in England, like a thick cloud, to obscure the vision of the credulous and unwary, had hardly any meaning in Scotland; objections about school-rates and compulsory attendance; about denominational schools and the conscience clause; about the admission of the Bible, and the exclusion of Catechism and Creeds. School-taxes were no new thing in Scotland. Every Heritor and Feuar had for generations, ever since the time

of Knox and the Reformation, been responsible for maintaining the parish-school, and paying the schoolmaster. There was in Scotland an hereditary hunger for education that was bound somehow to be satisfied.

Again, in England there is even now a strong tendency to be satisfied with a very low standard of National Education. The encouragement of half-timers and the permission of absence for trivial causes; boys allowed to leave school at an early age and with a low pass, in order to earn a little money for the moment, rendering temporary assistance to their parents at the expense of their whole life's career; the tendency to restrict the Public schools of England to the beggarly elements of the three R's—shutting the golden door of hope in the face of the poor man's clever boy by preventing him ever reaching the prizes of the higher education and whatever career his talents may entitle him, and recruiting the dangerous ranks of discontent; the mean and miserly insistence upon fees in cases of extreme poverty, sending the poor children to wander the streets because they have not brought the miserable school-pence; the grudging provision made for singing and drawing, for drill and athletics, which help so much to brighten the monotony of school routine; these, among others, give rise to the grumbles which John Bull is never tired of repeating. In Scotland they are hardly ever heard. There, everything is sacrificed to the "bairn's schooling," which, with a godly upbringing and an honest name, is the only legacy many a poor Scotsman can leave behind him.

A Minister of Education, like Mr. Mundella, who knows his business and puts his heart in it, is ambitious of raising the English schools to the Scottish standard. With too many, unfortunately, the aim has been to drag down the schools in Scotland to the miserable English level. With the Scottish Education Board sitting in London under the thumb of the English Ministers, and surrounded by influences of a depressing character, the result needs no prophet to foresee. With a National Parliament in Edinburgh, it would be easy to foretell how immense the improvement would be.

The ancient Universities of Scotland, of which her people have been so justly proud, have ample reasons to regret the loss of her National Parliament, and have had but little cause to thank the Imperial gathering at Westminster. As Oxford and Cambridge, with their wealthy colleges, needed no financial assistance, it was nearly impossible to persuade English Members of Parliament, who held the purse strings, that the Universities of Scotland were very differently situated. One gift Oxford and Cambridge received from Parliament for which the authorities never asked—viz., their thorough cleansing of the corruption and bigotry which made their foul nest within those ancient seats of learning when their

immense endowments were fraudulently treated as the exclusive heritage of a sect, and not the property of the entire nation.

The College authorities in Scotland never made any such miserable mistake; and, notwithstanding the excited condition of ecclesiastical affairs, the Universities have always been in close touch with Liberal thought and popular feeling. As the number of students increased, larger premises, and a better situation, became necessary; the recent great advance in natural and medical science required the appointment of new professors and costly appliances for their classes. To obtain the smallest grant from the Westminster Parliament was a well-nigh hopeless task, and the Universities had eventually to rely upon the bounty of patriotic Scotsmen. Had Scotland only an Exchequer of her own, this deplorable condition of affairs would not have continued for a single day.

The higher schools in Scotland for what is called secondary education stand in great need of organization and development. The old Grammar Schools and Royal Academies and High Schools in a number of the large towns have done good service in their day as a bridge between the parish school and the University; but, in too many cases, they have been allowed to sink into decrepitude and decay. The new Endowed Schools Commission has succeeded in removing a number of abuses, but these schools will never do all the good they might until they are under popular management and control.

When the entire education of the country, from the Free School in the Cowgate of Edinburgh, up through a graduated system to the National Universities, shall be in the hands of the Scottish people, no one from Westminster daring to make them afraid, or even to ask the reason why of anything they do—in respect to education; then, with their enterprising spirit, their prudence, their indomitable perseverance, their keen intelligence and liberal culture, there is no need to fear that Scotsmen, whether at home or abroad, will fall behind in the race.

Space will not permit the examination of several other subjects for important legislation, for which nothing has been done, owing to her association with English and Irish politics, although the opinion of Scotland has long been ripe. Measures touching the Churches, Disestablishment and Disendowment, the Land Laws, and the Game Laws and Deer Forests; the right of popular access to our Highland Mountains and Glens; touching Lighthouses, and Lifeboats, and Harbours of Refuge around her rocky coast; the fostering of the great Fishing industry, and the comfort and well-being of the Crofter population. With a few and rare exceptions, the opinion of English Members of Parliament on these and other urgent matters is worthless. Owing partly to pardonable ignorance, and, still more, to culpable prejudice, the Imperial Parliament lags a long way

behind, and the question, to which there is no satisfactory answer, is—Why should Scotland wait?

Those who have been carried far enough to see how very desirable, and, indeed, necessary, this reform is to the prosperity of Scotland, may desire to know how such a proposal can be practically carried out. Respecting some of the details of Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule measure for Ireland, particularly the financial arrangements, serious objections may, no doubt, be urged. Nevertheless, bearing in mind the marvellous open-mindedness of that great statesman, we have full confidence that in the course of discussion many of these would disappear.

In drawing a dividing line between Imperial and National politics, the simplest way is to reserve the few, though very important, subjects that belong to the Empire, leaving all the rest, which are so numerous that no list could well exhaust, to the subordinate National Parliament. The matters of Imperial concern are not many. The following comprise most, if not all, of them :—The British Constitution; the relations between the Crown, Lords, and Commons; the Army and Navy; questions of Peace and War; all Foreign, Colonial, and Indian affairs; the collection of the Imperial Revenue and arrangement of the National Debt. To these some would add the Post Office. All else may well be left to the various National Parliaments.

The grants from the Imperial Exchequer for separate national purposes would not be difficult to settle on an equitable basis. A good arrangement might be the allocation to each National Parliament of some imperial tax or taxes sufficient to cover the delegated duties, power being given to increase or decrease the rate within their own borders as each nationality might require.

Another fair financial arrangement would be the distribution to each local Parliament of the total amount voted by the Imperial Exchequer in proportion to an average made up of two or three elements for a term of years—(1) that of population; (2) that of property valuation; and possibly (3) that of mileage or acreage. These points are sufficiently clear without much argument to recommend them. The larger the population, the greater the need; those who contribute most may fairly claim a larger share; and a poor and scattered people, whose share under the first two heads might be small, ought to have the extent of country considered. As an illustration, suppose the Imperial Parliament thought it wise to vote, say, ten million pounds for Education. This sum would be distributed, in proportion to the combined average suggested, to each National Assembly "to mak' a kirk or a mill o't." If more was wanted, the local authorities would require to tax themselves; and if, from economic management, less was required, the balance could be devoted to some kindred purpose. This principle admits of easy application to most other matters.

The Scottish Cabinet need be neither large nor costly. Indeed, the first beneficial effect of Home Rule for Scotland, and still more for Ireland, will be a very substantial economy. The Premier may easily be Finance Minister as well. A Home Secretary and a legal official corresponding to the Lord Advocate are the only other indispensable Ministers. The vicious anomaly of one taking an active part in politics as a Cabinet Minister, and sitting on the bench as a Judge, like the English and Irish Lords Chancellor, should be wisely avoided. These three not-over-paid officials might associate with them any number of unpaid Ministers to advise as to future legislation, who would thus become qualified for more responsible duty when a vacancy occurred.

Our firm belief is that, with such a Scottish Parliament, elected by household suffrage, without regard to imperial politics, after making a clean sweep of the legislative arrears that have accumulated during the shameful neglect of so many wasted years, the regular business of an ordinary Session could be easily accomplished in about a month, with neither undue haste nor needless delay. Of course, the Members would give the whole day long to public business with a reasonable evening sitting; avoiding the unhealthy, feverish, and gassy excitement of sittings prolonged beyond midnight, when all honest folk are in bed. Presbyterians are familiar with the immense amount of business the annual Church Assemblies are able to discharge in a brief Session of about ten days.

A short Session like this would also settle the vexed question of the Payment of Members. There is no patriotic man, to whatever class he may belong, reasonably qualified to take a useful part in the National Parliament but could manage each year to spare a month to public affairs. For the same reason, Members would not mind being called together when some special occasion might require. This training-school for statesmen ought to save Scotland in the Imperial Parliament from the dreadful affliction of carpet-baggers, promoters of public companies, London guinea-pig directors, and, worst of all, ambitious barristers.

Each Nationality should have its own Executive Government, which would be responsible to the Local Parliament for all appointments, from the highest Judge on the Bench to the Village Postman. Every one knows how appointments are now made in Scotland and Ireland, not according to the merits of each case, or in accordance with National feeling, but solely as a reward for services to the particular political party that happens for the time to be predominant in the Imperial Parliament at Westminster. This mischievous practice often passes over the best men because they do not possess the necessary political influence, and rewards the numerous tribe of office-seekers who have unscrupulously attached themselves as supporters, through thick and thin, of one of the parties who govern the State.

With Home Rule Parliaments for Ireland, Scotland and Wales, the question arises—What is to be done with purely English business? The answer to this question must be given by the English people. Would Scottish, Irish and Welsh Members of the Imperial Parliament, after the exclusion of the affairs of their respective Nationalities, be at liberty to vote, &c., on English measures? Most certainly they would. If the English people want the honour of an Imperial Parliament to manage their local affairs, they must put up with the inevitable consequences. Besides, it would do the English people a world of good to understand for the first time the grievance under which the Irish, Scottish and Welsh people have groaned for centuries. We may be certain it would not last long. One Session would see the end of it.

These are merely suggestions that might easily be filled out in full detail. They are intended to help those with limited imagination, whose sympathies are with Home Rule, but who are at a loss to know how it can be practically carried out. They suffice to show that, in order to solve this problem that has vexed us and our fathers for centuries, we only require “the understanding heart and the willing mind.”

There is one point which has purposely been made conspicuous by its absence, and is now referred to with the scorn it deserves. “Home Rule,” you say, “and not a word about the *Integrity of the British Empire*.”

Scotsmen—ay, and Irishmen—have had too much to do with the building up of this British Empire to relinquish willingly any portion of their share in its honour and glory. On many a well-fought field, from rank and file to general, they have poured out their blood like water, more than maintained her ancient valour, carrying the old flag unstained to victory. Blot out the share of Scots and Irishmen in the conquest and government of India, and, pray, how much remains? In the triumphs of Peace, her sons stand no less distinguished. In Literature, in Science, and in Art they have achieved no ignoble name. In peopling our numerous Colonies, and in successfully guiding their affairs, their very misfortunes at home have assigned to them the lion's share. These are the folk, forsooth, in whose teeth is thrust the charge, that they, above all men, desire to degrade and disintegrate the British Empire.

Home Rule for Scotland is no reckless scheme of revolutionary Radicals, or the crazy dream of crack-brained enthusiasts; on the contrary, it is based upon a plea which every true Conservative ought to hold most dear: a claim to recover the liberties which our ancestors, to their great sorrow and our serious loss, thoughtlessly flung away, and to return to the good old paths which our forefathers ought never to have forsaken.

B. D. MACKENZIE.

THE SECRET HISTORY OF RELIGIONS.¹

ONE of the signs of the times is the growing tendency to return to Christianity by a new route. Ecclesiastical and dogmatic forms of Christianity are being rejected by the majority of cultured men : some retain their attachment to Christianity in a rationalized form ; others abandon it entirely and embrace Agnosticism, or scientific materialism ; but there are still others who are not content with rationalism or materialism, who are seeking to find rest for their souls in a mystical interpretation of Christian history and doctrine, in which they fondly hope to find a reconciliation of religion and science. These blend the most recent physical knowledge with abstruse and ancient speculations. Among this class, M. Schuré deservedly holds a high place ; he retains a warm attachment to Christianity, accepts the latest scientific discoveries, and endeavours to combine them in the solvent of a fervent imagination. M. Schuré is not a theologian, or a man of science, but a poet, the author of several volumes of poetry ; this may give us the key to his intellectual position. In *Les Grands Initiés* he has undertaken to solve the greatest problem of the age, and to establish religion on what he believes to be a scientific and indestructible basis. This work is the fullest and most complete statement of the doctrines of Theosophy that we have yet seen, for it is in those doctrines that M. Schuré finds his solution. It is from the point of view of *Comparative esoterism* that he undertakes to demonstrate the unity of all religions, and their harmony with science. Modern religion and modern science have no point of unity—it is from this he starts ; the greatest evil of our time, he says, is that religion and science appear as two hostile and irreducible forces. The Church cannot prove its dogmas in the face of the objections of science, and it opposes faith to reason as an absolute commandment ; science, making an abstraction of the physical and intellectual world, has become agnostic in its method, and materialistic in its principles, as in its end ; philosophy, disconcerted and powerless between the two, has abandoned its rights and fallen into a transcendent scepticism, and thus a profound division is made in the soul of society as in that of the individual.

¹ *Les Grands Initiés, Esquisse de l'Histoire Secrète des Religions.* Par Edouard Schuré. [Rama, Krishna, Hermès, Moïse, Orphée, Pythagore, Platon, Jésus.] Perrin & Cie. Paris. 1889.

This conflict, which was at first necessary and useful, in order to establish the rights of Reason and Science, has ended by becoming a cause of impotence and decay. Religion without proof, and science without hope, are standing face to face, defying one another without the power to conquer. Thus there is profound contradiction, a hidden war, not only between the State and the Church, but even in Science itself, in the bosom of all the churches, and in the consciences of all thoughtful individuals. The reconciliation, we are invited to believe, is to be found in esoteric Theosophy, which, according to our author, is at once scientific and religious; how this is to be accomplished, it is the purpose of this able and, in some respects, fascinating book to show.

M. Schuré, while intensely religious, accepts the latest discoveries of science; but it is in the region of speculation and imagination that he finds the means of effecting the desired reconciliation. He takes as his motto a sentence of Claude Bernard—"Je suis persuadé q'un jour viendra où le physiologiste, le poète et le philosophe parleront la même langue et s'entenderont tous."

But in himself the poet predominates; and, gifted with a fertile and fervent imagination, he fuses the purest morality with the latest science and the wildest speculations. The result is the formulation of a well-arranged and complete system of Theosophy, which, however, makes as great a demand upon our faith as the dogmas of the Church which it is intended to supersede.

M. Schuré acknowledges his indebtedness for many of his ideas to Fabre d'Olivet, who, more than sixty years ago, introduced the esoteric doctrines to French readers. He was the author of *La Langue hébraïque restituée*, *Vers dorés de Pythagore*, and *Histoire philosophique du genre humain*. We are also directed to a more recent work: *La Mission des Juifs*, by M. Saint-Yves d'Alveydre—M. Saint-Yves being, like M. Schuré, a disciple of d'Olivet.

In order to fulfil his aim in giving the public a complete system of Theosophy, M. Schuré has not only given a very elaborate statement of the doctrines which, we presume, he accepts, but has reconstructed the lives of the great Initiates; and here, as it will be seen, he relies upon his imagination to fill up the slight traditional material which is all we have had up till now; but the most original part of the work is that in which, in every case, he endeavours to prove the assumption contained in his title, that these great examples he has chosen from the founders of great religions all owed their power and knowledge to an Initiation into the secret doctrines of Theosophy, and that there was an actual affiliation or descent in the orders, to one or other of which they all belonged. The likeness between them was not due to any vague wave of influence, which moved them in different epochs and countries to seek for truth in the same direction, but was due to a direct and organic connection,

which extended from land to land, and from century to century. There was, in the course of ages, a development of spirit and insight and power, and the later initiates saw and knew and accomplished more than the earlier ones. Yet there was a distinct and unbroken line from the earliest to the latest, from Rama, the Aryan priest, to Jesus, the last and greatest of the sons of God.

“ Dans cette série, Rama ne fait voir que les abords du temple. Krishna et Hermès en donnent la clef. Moïse, Orphée et Pythagore en montrent l'intérieur. Jésus-Christ en représenté le sanctuaire.”

As in England, so far as we know, no such complete statement of theosophic doctrines has appeared, it will only be just to M. Schuré, and it may be interesting to our readers, to give an account of them as nearly as possible in his own words.

The worship of Aryan man, from the beginning of civilization, turned towards the sun as towards the source of light, of warmth, of life. But when the thoughts of the sages ascended from the phenomenon to the cause, they conceived, behind this sensible fire and this visible light, an immaterial fire and an intellectual light. They identified the first with the masculine principle, with the creator spirit, or intellectual essence, of the universe, and the second with its feminine principle, its formative soul, its plastic substance. This intuition ascends to an immemorial time. The conception is blended with the oldest theologies. It circulates in the Vedic hymns under the form of Agni, the universal fire which penetrates all things. It appears in the religion of Zoroaster, of which the worship of Mithras represents the esoteric part. Mithras is the masculine fire, and Mitra the feminine light. Zoroaster said, formally, that the Eternal created, by means of the living word, the celestial light, the seed of Ormuzd, the origin of material light and material fire. For the initiate of Mithras, the sun is only the grosser reflection of this light. In his obscure grotto, the vault of which was painted with stars, he invoked the sun of grace, the fire of love, the conqueror of evil, the reconciler of Ormuzd and Ahriman, the purifier and mediator, which dwells in the soul of the holy prophets. In the crypts of Egypt the initiates sought the same sun under the name of Osiris. When Hermes desired to contemplate the origin of things, he first felt himself plunged into the ethereal waves of a delicious light, where all living forms were moving. Then he was thrust into the darkness of dense matter, and he heard a voice which he recognized as the *voice of the light*. At the same time a fire sprang from the depths, and chaos became orderly and bright. In the Book of the Dead of the Egyptians, souls ride painfully towards this light in the bark of Isis. Moses has fully adopted this doctrine in Genesis:—“God said, let there be light, and there was light.” But the creation of this light preceded that of the sun and stars. This is as much as to say, that, in the order of origins and of the cosmogony, intellectual light pre-

cedes material light. The Greeks, who cast the most abstract ideas into a human and dramatic form, expressed the same doctrine in the myth of the hyperborean Apollo.

The human spirit comes by the internal contemplation of the universe to conceive an intellectual light, an imponderable element, serving as an intermediary between matter and spirit. It will be easy to show that modern scientists approach insensibly to the same conclusion by an opposite route—that is to say, in seeking the constitution of matter, and in seeing the impossibility of explaining it by itself. In the sixteenth century, Paracelsus, in studying the chemical combinations and the metamorphoses of bodies, came to admit a universal and occult agent, by means of which they operated. The natural philosophers of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, who conceived of the universe as a dead machine, believed in the absolute emptiness of the celestial spaces. Now that we know that light is not the emission of radiant matter, but the vibration of an imponderable element, we must admit that all space is filled with a fluid, infinitely subtle; which penetrates all bodies, and by which the waves of light and heat are transmitted. We thus return to the physical and theosophical ideas of the Greeks. The ether, which the thought of Newton found in space, Paracelsus had found at the bottom of his alembics, and had called it the astral light. But this imponderable fluid, everywhere present, which penetrates all, this subtle but indispensable agent, this light, invisible to our eyes, but which is at the bottom of all scintillations and phosphorescences, a German physiologist has established by a series of experiments. Reichenbach noticed luminous emanations from certain bodies and persons in perfectly dark chambers. In the first phase of their sleep, somnambulists sometimes see their magnetizers with these same signs. The pure astral light appears only in the highest ecstasy, but it is polarized in all bodies, it combines with all terrestrial fluids, and plays divers parts in electricity, and in terrestrial and animal magnetism.

We come, then, to see that modern physics must recognize a universal, imponderable agent to explain the world, that it has even established the presence of, it, and that it has re-entered, without knowing it, into the ideas of ancient theosophies. Let us now attempt, continues M. Schuré, to define the nature and the function of the cosmic fluid, according to the occult philosophy of every age. For, on this first principle of the cosmogony, Zoroaster agrees with Heraclitus, Pythagoras with St. Paul, the Cabbalists with Paracelsus. It reigns everywhere, Cybele-Maya, the great soul of the world, the vibrating and plastic substance which the breath of the Creator Spirit governs by His will. Its ethereal oceans serve as a cement between all the worlds. It is the great mediatrix between the invisible and the visible, between spirit and matter, between the interior and the

exterior of the universe. Condensed in enormous masses in the atmosphere, it bursts in thunder; drunk in by the earth, it circulates in magnetic currents; subtilized in the nervous system of the animal, it transmits its will to the members, its sensations to its brain. Still more, this subtle fluid forms likenesses to the material bodies of living organisms; for it serves as the substance of the astral body of the soul, the luminous vestment which the spirit weaves for itself without ceasing. It not only materializes spirit and spiritualizes matter, but it reflects in its animated bosom human things, thoughts, and fancies in a perpetual mirage. The strength and duration of these images is proportioned to the intensity of the will which produces them. There is no other means of explaining the suggestion and transmission of thought at a distance, the magic principle which is now established by science. So the past of worlds trembles in the astral light in uncertain images, and the future marches there with the living souls whom an inevitable destiny compels to descend into the flesh. There is the meaning of the veil of Isis and the mantle of Cybele, in which are woven all beings.

This leads to a consideration of Clairvoyance, which is recognized by theosophy as a scientific condition. If clairvoyance is an abnormal state from a bodily point of view, it is a normal and higher state from the point of view of the spirit. In it consciousness has become more profound, its vision wider. The self is the same, but it has passed on to a higher plane, where its outlook is released from the grosser organs of the body, and penetrates to a wider horizon. Clairvoyance has three stages—*retrospection*, a vision of past events, preserved in the astral light, and revived by the sympathy of the seer; *divination*, properly so called, is a problematic vision of the future, it may be by an introspection of the thoughts of the living which contain the germ of future actions, or it may be by the occult influence of higher spirits who unroll the future in living images before the soul of the clairvoyant; and, lastly, *ecstasy*, which is defined as a vision of the spiritual world, where good or bad spirits appear to the seer under human form, and communicate with him.

This, then, is the point in which M. Schuré sees a means of establishing a scientific theosophy. The cosmic ether supplies him with the stuff out of which dreams and many other things are made. But though science may admit the presence of a universal, imponderable fluid, it is not prepared in the least to allow all that the theosophists claim for it. When we pass from the known fact of the transmission of light to the clairvoyance which sees preserved in the astral fluid the images of past events and the luminous shadows of future ones, we leave science very far behind. So that the theosophist, like the theologian, must still complain of the incredulity of the natural philosopher, and hope for his conversion.

“Ce sera, selon nous, la tâche de l'avenir de rendre aux facultés

transcendantes de l'âme humaine leur dignité et leur fonction sociale, en les réorganisant sous le contrôle de la science et sur les bases d'une religion—vraiment universelle, ouverte à toute les vérités. Alors la science, régénérée par la vraie foi et par l'esprit de charité, atteindra, les yeux ouverts, à ces sphères où la philosophie spéculative erre, les yeux bandés et en tâtonnant. Oui, la science deviendra voyante et rédemptrice, à mesure qu'augmentera en elle la conscience et l'amour de l'humanité. Et peut-être est-ce par "la porte du sommeil et des songes," comme disait le vieil Homère, que la divine Psyché, bannie de notre civilisation et qui pleure en silence sous son voile, rentrera en possession de ses autels."

We have given this full account of the astral light, because, without a belief in the existence of this cosmic fluid, theosophy would be impossible. It is also the point, as we have said, where M. Schuré sees the possibility of claiming a scientific basis for his doctrine. Certainly, if it could be proved that the cosmic ether performs all the functions attributed to the astral light, his claim would have to be allowed; but at present there seems no likelihood of its being proved to the satisfaction of science, so that it remains merely a matter of speculation.

When we come to consider the doctrines and cosmogony of the theosophists, and ask how do they know so much and are so certain about their knowledge, we find it is by means of this astral light they obtain it, or rather that it was obtained by the adepts. The Great Initiates had, by long preparation and the severest discipline, reached a condition in which second-sight, or clairvoyance, was natural to them—the past and the future, the evolution of worlds and souls, all stages of existence were unveiled to them through the medium of the astral light.

"La lumière astrale s'y révèle comme le médium universel des phénomènes de vision et d'extase, et les explique. Elle est à la fois le véhicule qui transmet les mouvements de la pensée et le miroir vivant où l'âme contemple les images du monde matériel et spirituel. Une fois transporté dans cet élément, l'esprit du voyant sort des conditions corporelles. La mesure de l'espace et du temps change pour lui. Il participe en quelque sort, à l'ubiquité du fluide universel. La matière opaque devient transparente pour lui; et l'âme se dégageant du corps, s'élevant dans le monde spirituel, à voir les âmes revêtues de leur corps étherés et à communiquer avec elles. Tous les anciens initiés avaient l'idée nette de cette *seconde vue* ou vue directe de l'esprit."

Having noted the means by which theosophy professes to arrive at its knowledge of things, we shall be interested in examining some of the articles of its creed; for the so-called theosophy which disavows any and every creed can only be considered spurious, and would evidently not be recognized by the author of *Les Grands Initiés*.

Esoteric theosophy, as formulated by him, is a true gnosticism, and professes to be intimately acquainted with "le dedans et le dehors de l'univers."

It is in his book on Pythagoras that we have the fullest account of the esoteric doctrine. Pythagoras admitted that the spirit of man receives from God its immortal nature, invisible and absolutely active; for the spirit is that which is self-moved. He called the body its mortal part, divisible and passive. He thought that that which we call *soul* is closely related to the spirit, but formed of a third intermediary element provided by the *cosmic fluid*. The soul resembles an ethereal body which the spirit weaves or constructs for itself. The soul has a form resembling the body, which it survives after dissolution or death.

We pass on to the Cosmogony. The four elements of which the stars and all beings are formed indicate four graduated conditions of matter. The first is the most dense and gross, and most refractory to the spirit; the last is the most refined, showing the greatest affinity for it. The fifth, or *ethereal* element, represents a state of matter so subtle and lively, that it is only atomic, and endowed with universal penetration. It is the original cosmic fluid, the astral light, and soul of the world. Pythagoras knew that the earth in a state of fusion was primitively surrounded with a gaseous atmosphere, which, liquified by successive coolings, has formed the seas. Here the animal and vegetable kingdoms which have appeared, and the invisible germs, floating in the ethereal *aura* of the earth, circulating in its gaseous robe, were drawn into the depths of the sea or attracted to the first continents which emerged. The vegetable and animal worlds, as yet confounded, appeared nearly at the same time. The esoteric doctrine admits the transformation of animal species, not only according to the secondary law of *selection*, but, still more, according to the primary law of the *percussion* of the earth by celestial powers, and of all living beings by intellectual principles and invisible forces. When a new species appeared on the globe, it was because a race of souls of a higher type incarnated itself at a given epoch in the descendants of the ancient species, in order to cause it to ascend in the scale by moulding it and transforming it to its image. It is in this way that the esoteric doctrine explains the appearance of man upon the earth. But this suffices to explain his entry on the scene only as it suffices to explain the appearance of the first algæ or the first crustacean in the depths of the sea. All the successive creations suppose, as does each birth, the percussion of the earth by invisible powers, which create life. That of man supposes an anterior kingdom of a celestial humanity, which presided at the unfolding of terrestrial humanity, and sent it, like the waves of a formidable tide, in new torrents of souls, which incarnated themselves in his loins, and lit the first rays of a divine day in this wild, impulsive, audacious being,

who, scarcely released from darkness and animalism, is compelled, in order to live, to struggle with all the powers of nature.

The cosmogony of the visible world, said Pythagoras, conducts us to the history of the earth, and that to the mystery of the human soul. With it we touch the sanctuary of sanctuaries, the arcana of arcanas. After the evolution of the earth, he relates that of the evolution of souls across the worlds. Outside Initiation, this doctrine is known as the *transmigration of souls*. On no part of the occult doctrine has there been more misunderstanding than on this. So much so, that ancient literature as well as modern knows only puerile travesties of it. Plato himself, who of all philosophers has most contributed to popularize it, has only given us fantastic, and sometimes extravagant, glimpses. It may be that his prudence, it may be that his vows, forbade him to tell all he knew. Few people doubt to-day that it must have had for the initiates a scientific aspect, opening infinite prospectives, and giving to the 'soul divine' consolations. The doctrine of the ascensional life of the soul across a series of existences is the common feature of esoteric traditions, and the crowning of theosophy. It has for us a capital importance; for man to-day rejects with an equal contempt the abstract and vague immortality of philosophy and the infantile heaven of primitive religion. Yet he dreads the barrenness and annihilation of materialism. He aspires unconsciously to the consciousness of an *organic immortality* which shall answer to the demands of his reason and the indestructible wants of his soul.

The human soul alone comes from heaven, and returns to it after death. But what journeys, what incarnations, what planetary cycles must it traverse for the human soul to become the man we know! According to the esoteric traditions of India and Egypt, the individuals which compose actual humanity have commenced their human existence on other planets, where matter is much less dense than on ours. The body of man was then nearly vaporous, his incarnations light and easy. His faculties of direct spiritual perception were very powerful and subtle in that human phase; his reason and intelligence were, on the contrary, in an embryonic state. In this semi-corporeal, semi-spiritual condition, he saw spirits, all was charm and splendour to his eyes, music to his ears. He did not think or reflect, he scarcely willed. He let himself live by drinking in sounds and shapes and light, floating like a dream from life to death, from death to life. That was what Orpheus called *le ciel de Saturne*. It is only by becoming incarnate on planets more and more dense that man is materialized. By becoming incarnate in denser matter, humanity has lost its spiritual sense; but by its increasing struggle with the external world, it has powerfully developed its reason, its intelligence, and its will. The earth is the last stage of this descent into matter, which Moses called the expulsion from

Paradise—and Orpheus, the fall into the sublunary circle. From hence, man can re-ascend painfully the circle in a series of new existences, and recover his spiritual sense by the free exercise of his intellect and will. Then only, say the disciples of Hermes and Orpheus, man acquires by his *action* the consciousness and possession of the divine; then only he becomes a son of God, and those who have borne this name on earth, must have, before they appeared among us, descended and re-ascended this terrible spiral.

Having thus given some account of the esoteric doctrines, we are free to follow the writer briefly in his historical *résumé* of the lives of the Initiates. He commences at the source, as he believes it to be, of all subsequent religions, with the Aryan cycle, of which Rama is the chosen representative. He regards the worship of the Great Ancestor as the commencement of religion. It originated with a woman who believed the Great Ancestor of the people had appeared to her. So the cult was carried on by women, organized in colleges of druidesses, under the surveillance of old men. At first they were beneficent, but the rapid corruption of the institution was inevitable. The druidesses felt themselves to be the masters of the people, and, when inspiration failed, ruled by terror. They instituted human sacrifices, and the blood of victims ran without ceasing on the altars. Rama was destined for a priest, but his spirit revolted from this bloody cult. He studied the virtues of plants and the influences of the stars. When a plague fell on the race, Rama sorrowfully sought the means of salvation—a majestic figure appeared to him in a dream, and told him how to use the mistletoe as a cure. With this he became famous throughout Scythia. Then he was seized with a desire to heal the moral plague of his people. Elected chief of the priests, he ordained that human sacrifices should cease. A struggle ensued between him and the druidesses. Then the same spirit appeared to him again, revealing himself as Deva Nahousha, and commanded him to lead his people to the East. Rama obeyed, and led the *élite* of his race into the heart of Asia, where he abolished human sacrifices and instituted the worship of the sacred fire. He became master of India and the spiritual king of the earth. From Rama we are led to Krishna, the son of the virgin Devaki, and the religion of India. Here, as in every case, M. Schuré *reconstructs* the biography of the Great Initiate, and gives us a romantic history of a legendary personage. From India, esoteric doctrines are introduced into Egypt by Hermes. He was the first, the Great Initiator of Egypt; the doctrine of the Original Fire, enclosed in the *Vision of Hermes*, remains the centre and summit of Egyptian initiation. We are then treated to an account of the tests to which the novice was subjected in order to prepare him for initiation, the final one being a death-like trance from which he awoke, signifying death and resurrection. "None are free of the threshold of Osiris,"

said the hierophant to the novice, "without passing through death and resurrection." From Hermes and Egypt, esoterism descended on the one side to Greece by Orpheus, in whom M. Schuré sees a real person, Pythagoras and Plato; and, on the other side, to Israel by Moses. These two streams met again in Judea, in the Jewish Greek order of the Essene, into which Joseph of Nazareth and Jesus his son were initiated.

This is a general outline of M. Schuré's religious history. Some of the details deserve a fuller account than we have space for. It would be interesting to relate how the life of Moses and the Mission of Israel is reconstructed in the light of esoterism. The book of Genesis, or, at least, the part consisting of the first ten chapters of it, is received as an original work, containing, esoterically, of course, all the wisdom of the Egyptians and the germs of future science. Our author is not unacquainted with modern criticism, but he rejects its conclusions. The biblical exegesis of the century, he says, has made the idea fashionable that Genesis is not the work of Moses, that even this prophet never existed, and is only a legendary personage fabricated four or five centuries later by the Jewish priesthood to give themselves a divine origin. This opinion is based on the circumstance that Genesis is composed of divers fragments [Elohistic and Jehovistic] brought together, and that the actual redaction is later by, at least, four hundred years than the Exodus. The facts established by this criticism, as far as the text which we possess is concerned, are correct; the conclusions which are drawn from them are arbitrary and illogical. Because the Elohist or Jehovist wrote four hundred years after the Exodus, it does not follow that they did not work on an older document. Because the Pentateuch gives us a legendary story of Moses, it does not follow that it contains nothing true. Moses becomes living, all his prodigious career is explained by replacing him in his natal spot—the solar temple of Memphis. The depths of Genesis can only be seen by the light of torches snatched from the Initiation of Isis and Osiris.

Moses, or, rather, Osarsiph, we are told, was incontestably the organizer of monotheism. He was an initiated Egyptian priest of Osiris, who had the daring to make the highest principle of initiation, for monotheism as a secret doctrine was taught in the sanctuaries of Egypt, the one dogma of national religion; and the prudence to reveal its full consequences only to a small number of initiates, and to impose it on the mass of the people by fear. For this enterprise, he found a people already prepared to his hand in the tribes of Hebrews, particularly those who were settled in the land of Goshen, living in servitude under the name of the sons of Jacob. For the establishment of a monotheistic religion, he had also precursors in the persons of the nomad and pacific kings whom the Bible presents

to us under the names of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. M. Schuré sees initiates everywhere. Who were the patriarchs? Abraham has passed into the mythological history of all people. The "pater Orchanus" of Ovid is the same person that the Bible represents as emigrating from the land of Ur to the land of Canaan at the command of the Eternal. The covenant between God and Abraham, translated into the language of our own day, signifies that a very ancient Semitic chief of the name of Abram, who had probably received the Chaldean initiation, felt himself drawn by an inward voice to conduct his tribes towards the West, and impose on them the worship of Elohim. The name of Isaac, by the prefix Is, seems to indicate an Egyptian initiation, as those of Jacob and of Joseph give us a glimpse of a Phœnician origin. However that may be, it is probable that the three patriarchs were three chiefs of different people who lived at different epochs. A long time after Moses the Israelitish legend grouped them in a single family, Isaac became the son of Abram, and Jacob the son of Isaac. This manner of representing intellectual paternity by physical paternity was very common amongst ancient priests. From this genealogy we gather one leading fact: the filiation of monotheistic worship across the patriarchal initiates of the desert. That these men had inward warnings, spiritual revelations, under the form of dreams, or even of visions, in a waking state, would be nothing contrary to esoteric science, nor to the universal psychical laws which govern souls and worlds. These facts have taken, in the Biblical story, the naïve form of the visits of angels whom they entertained under their tents.

Osarsiph was the real or adopted son of the sister of Ramesis II., and the cousin of Menephtah. He was a priest of Osiris, and decidedly not an Israelite. Ramesis looked upon him as a possible aspirant to the throne and a rival to his own son. One day, in a fit of indignation, he slew an Egyptian guard. He fled to the land of Midian, and sought refuge with Jethro, a priest, who possessed treasures of learning, stored in his memory and in the stone books of his temple. Osarsiph, in order to expiate the crime of murder of which he had been guilty, had to submit himself again to various trials which were exacted by the priests of Osiris. Passing successfully through the ordeals, he felt himself transformed, and, to mark the new era which had begun in his life, he took the name of Moses, which signifies "the saved." With Jethro he remained many years, and here he found two books of the cosmogony cited in Genesis, the *Wars of Jehovah* and the *Generations of Adam*. Studying these, the purpose of his life was born. Before him, Rama, Krishna, Hermes, Zoroaster had created religions for their people. Moses would create a people for the eternal religion. For this project he needed a powerful base, and this was his object in composing the *Sepher Bereshit*, his Book of Origins. Without attempting to follow

M. Schuré in his exposition of the esoteric sense of the first ten chapters of Genesis, we can only just indicate the way Moses carried out his mission. Truly, says our author, the plan of Moses was one of the most extraordinary and one of the most audacious a man had ever conceived. It was to release a whole people from the power of Egypt; to lead them to the conquest of a country occupied by a hostile and well-armed population; to lead them for forty years in the desert, consumed by thirst and enfeebled by hunger; to isolate them with the tabernacle of the Eternal in the midst of idolatrous nations, to impose monotheism upon them with a rod of fire, and to inspire them with such fear and veneration for the One God, that He should become their national symbol, the end of all their aspirations, and their *raison d'être*. As the pilgrim host progressed through the desert, the priests carried in their midst the Ark of gold which contained the *Sepher Bereshit*, or a book of the cosmogony written out by Moses in Egyptian hieroglyphics, the magic wand of the prophet, and also the book of the Covenant, or Law of Sinai. It was by the mixture of terror and of mystery that Moses imposed his law and his worship on his people. It was necessary to impress the idea of Jehovah in letters of fire on their soul; and, without the implacable measures he employed, monotheism had never triumphed over the polytheism of Phœnicia and Babylon. It was not a willing, but an unwilling people Moses commanded. By the scenes of Sinai, by the execution of rebels *en masse*, Moses acquired an authority over the wandering Semites, whom he kept down with an iron hand. Still, we are reminded that, according to the Pentateuch, Moses triumphed over all obstacles by the most improbable miracles. The sons of Aaron, and the adherents of Korah and Dathan, in all forty thousand men, are slain at a blow! And Moses evokes an earthquake, at a fixed hour, which engulfs the three rebel chiefs and their tents and families. These, however, are only exaggerations of the occult powers possessed by Moses. These occult powers are always attributed to the ancient magi and priests. In every case these phenomena are of an electrical order. But the electricity of the terrestrial atmosphere can be put in motion by a more subtle and universal force everywhere distributed which the great adepts know how to attract, concentrate, and project. This theory has nothing in it contrary to a rational conception of the universe, and it is indispensable to explain a crowd of phenomena which otherwise remain incomprehensible. These points settled, we are told that Moses, sustained by the spiritual powers which protected him, and handling the ethereal force with consummate skill, was able to make the Ark serve as a sort of receptacle of attractive concentration for the production of electrical phenomena of an overwhelming character. But these phenomena could only have been limited and rare. The sacerdotal legend exaggerates them. It must have sufficed to Moses to have struck

dead a few rebellious chiefs, or a few disobedient Levites, by such a projection of the fluid in order to terrorize and master all the people. Such, in outline, is the character and mission of Moses in the light of comparative esoterism.

The aim of this book is not only to give us an account of the ancient theosophists, but, primarily and finally, to show that esoteric religion reached its fulfilment in Jesus, and in this way, as we said at first, to give us a new and mystical Christianity. The life of Jesus is therefore re-written from an esoteric point of view, which it is only possible to indicate. It is exceedingly beautiful and sympathetic, but at the same time romantic. It is largely the work of imagination, and, while the author discards many legends, he substitutes, for them a story of the life of Christ which is probably as far from the truth. Intensely moved by the sufferings of his countrymen, Jesus longs to help and save them. He is attracted to the secret order of the Essenes by a natural sympathy. Why, asks M. Schuré, do the Evangelists never speak against the Essenes as they do against other sects? Evidently, he answers, because they considered the Essenes like themselves, they were linked to them by the vow of the Mysteries, and the sect was blended with the Christians. Jesus passed some years with the Essenes, learnt their doctrines, submitted to their discipline, studied with them the secrets of nature and occult therapeutics. It was a memorable night, we are told, for the order of the Essenes, and for the new adept, when he received, in the most profound secrecy, the higher initiation of the fourth degree, which was only accorded in the special case of a prophetic mission. The chief of the order was there with the elders, he presented the chalice of gold, the symbol of the supreme initiation, which held the *wine of the vine of the Lord*, the symbol of Divine inspiration. Some said Moses had drunk from it with the sixty-six elders, others made it ascend to Abraham, who received from Melchisedek the same initiation under the species of bread and wine. This we are told later on was the origin of the Last Supper, by which Jesus intended to show that He made His disciples fellow initiates, and through them all mankind. We then have a beautiful picture of the career of Jesus, His meeting with John the Baptist, the inward struggle figured under the temptation in the wilderness, the vision of the cross, and His self-consecration to the salvation of mankind, with all its consequences. The esoteric sense of the Gospels is then unveiled, and a glowing estimate given of the work of Christ in the past and future.

“Vu du dehors et au point de vue terrestre, le drame messianique finit sur la croix. Sublime en soi, il lui manque cependant l'accomplissement de la promesse. Vu du dedans, du fond de la conscience de Jésus et au point de vue celeste, il a trois actes dont *la Tentation*, *la Transfiguration*, et *la Résurrection* marquent les sommets. *Ces

trois phases représentent en d'autres termes : l'initiation du Christ, la Révélation totale, et le Couronnement de l'œuvre. Elles correspondent assez bien à ce que les apôtres et les chrétiens initiés des premiers siècles nommèrent *les Mystère du Fils, du Père, et du Saint-Esprit.*"

In our summary of this interesting work we have been compelled to touch very briefly upon the most attractive portion, that is, the lives of the Initiates as re-written in the poetical and imaginative spirit of this modern theosophist. We have attempted to give some idea of the doctrines which are being revived in our own day. Criticism upon them is hardly necessary ; as they have been taught in one form or another, and rejected over and over again. They have a fascination for a certain class of minds, but M. Schuré has not succeeded in proving that in the present era they are any more supported by science than they were in former times. The existence of an ethereal form of matter cannot, perhaps, be doubted ; but the assertion that it lends support to the esoteric doctrine is received with scepticism by scientific men. On one side it is maintained that this occult force approaches that which is known as animal magnetism, the existence of which has not yet commanded indisputable scientific recognition. Many of the phenomena at one time attributed to this influence, it is now decidedly known, are due to less occult causes. Much of the mystery of animal magnetism has vanished before the facts of hypnotism. The indulgence in the belief of the possibility of obtaining the power of wielding occult forces, and of acquiring an intimate knowledge of the unseen, is not conducive to a healthy state of mind, nor is it likely to lead to a rational view of the universe. To think we may learn in visions and dreams, things we cannot discover by the ordinary processes of investigation and research, is calculated to derange the mind, and lead us to prefer illusions to the truth. That M. Schuré himself has escaped the worst results of this form of faith must be admitted. His imagination, fervent and vivid as it is, is apparently always well under control, and his work, taken as a series of romantic histories, is charmingly written, and entirely free from the wild and rhapsodical outbursts in which some theosophists indulge. Throughout, the tone is of the most elevated character, the morality unimpeachable, the charity universal, and the pathos genuine. But there is no guarantee that others who may accept the conclusions of the book will be able to exhibit the same control ; it would probably be the same with them as Gibbon said it was with the Gnostics, whom they resemble. "The Gnostics blended with the faith of Christ many sublime and obscure tenets, which they derived from oriental philosophy ; and even from the religion of Zoroaster, concerning the eternity of matter, the existence of two principles, and the mysterious hierarchy of the invisible world. As soon as they launched into that

vast abyss, they delivered themselves to the guidance of a disordered imagination.”¹ That this descent is already in progress may be gathered from the pretensions of Mdme. Blavatsky and her followers. “All that she claimed,” Mrs. Besant informs us, “was that she knew more about these [occult] forces than did the people about her, and could, therefore, do things which they could not. A good many of the apparent miracles turned merely on the use of magnetic force, a force about the marvels of which science is finding out more year after year. Mdme. Blavatsky is able to utilize this force, which every one admits is around us, in us, and in non-living things, without the apparatus used at the present time by science for its manipulation. Other of the phenomena were what she called ‘psychological tricks,’ illusions, conjuring on the mental plane as does the ordinary conjurer on the material.”²

M. Schuré would not descend to talking about “psychological tricks” or “conjuring on the mental plane;” but this is what theosophy leads to. Mdme. Blavatsky only claims to have the same powers which the author of *Les Grands Initiés* attributes to Moses; the claim in one case being no better founded than in that of the other.

If religion is to be reconciled with science, it will have to be on more rational grounds than those supplied by occult philosophy. There is too much mystery about it to commend it to popular acceptance. In M. Schuré’s story of the Initiates there is a prevailing semi-darkness, the thunder is always rolling, the lightning always flashing; revelations are made to seers under the starry skies, in solemn forests, or in gloomy crypts lit by mysterious lamps—never in the open day.

“La cosmogonie et la psychologie ésotériques touchaient aux plus grands mystères de la vie, et des secrets dangereux et jalousement gardés des sciences et des arts occultes. Aussi, Pythagore aimait-il à donner ces leçons loin du jour profane, la nuit, au bord de la mer, sur les terrasses du temple de Cérès, au murmure léger de la vague ionienne, d’une si mélodieuse cadence, aux lointaines phosphorescences du Kosmos étoilé; ou bien, dans les cryptes du sanctuaire, où des lampes égyptiennes de naphte répandaient une clarte égale et douce.”

A religion that can be reconciled with science will have to be one which will bear the full light of open day, which can be apprehended by all men—and not a secret consolation, intelligible only to an initiated few.

WALTER LLOYD.

¹ *Decline and Fall*, chap xv.

² *Why I became a Theosophist*. Mrs. Besant, p. 27.

WORKMEN AND POLITICS.

IN considering the subject of workmen and politics, we propose to put two questions, and to answer them as simply as we can. 1st—Why should workmen be politicians? 2nd—Why should workmen be Liberal politicians?

In his letters to a Sunderland working-man, Mr. Ruskin expresses great impatience at being forced by the present conditions of our civilization to interest himself in, and form conclusions upon, all manner of political questions. He protests that he should be allowed, without so much impertinent interference as now, to go about his proper business of art-criticism. He suggests that his friend the cork-cutter should similarly be left free for the cutting of corks, and he urges that the men who, by choice and training, have the making and administering of laws, should have the goodness to attend to that business themselves, and attend to it honestly, so that the rest of the community may the better mind its own immediate affairs.

We, for our part, can sympathise with this pathetic outcry of a much-worried philosopher. We do not agree with it, however. In the spheres of civil and national government nothing can be done in which we have not an individual interest, and nothing be rightly done which is not guided by the common sense of the community, that is, upon the agreement of the mass of individuals as to what is best for themselves individually.

It is, no doubt, most desirable that the art-critic should be free to criticise wisely, and the cork-cutter to help the community by *his* vocation; but whilst the art-critic might get on very well without the cork-cutter, and whilst the happiness of the cork-cutter might not very greatly depend on the proficiency of the art-critic, both are essentially concerned in the laws made by the State for their own government, and in the taxation which is imposed upon them. Government affects them in common. Where there is a difference in the degree of the effect, it is almost always adverse and harmful just in proportion to the helplessness or the indifference of the individuals concerned. Temperate men object to the laws of eating being determined by those autocrats of the table, the gluttons or the ascetics; it would not be wise for the laws of drinking to be referred to a convention of confirmed toppers, nor, for the matter of that, of total-abstinence men—acting without reference to the common sense

of the community. So it must be in general politics and government.

If there is one thing more written down in the history of mankind than another it is this—that no one set of people can safely be entrusted with the unrestricted privilege of determining what is best for other people, and imposing their will upon other people. This is not necessarily because of a conscious selfishness on the part of such a privileged class. It is because of the impossibility of any man or set of men so entirely entering into sympathy with the proper needs and aspirations of others as to be fit to arbitrarily determine what other people most need, or most like, or most ought to like. Even apparent goodness of intention on the part of an autocrat may often lead him sadly astray. It would be next to impossible to convince a Royal Family, in the receipt of about a million sterling annually, and for whom, over and above, sundry palaces and pleasure-gardens are provided, that their services are not of inestimable advantage to those who pay the money. Nay, if the veriest Democrat were suddenly made a Royal personage, we are sure he would be able to make out a very good case, from his own point of view, in favour of the "beggary allowance" made to him being substantially augmented as a means of increasing the facilities for the exercise of his Royal bounty and usefulness. In the same way, it would be hard to convince a military legislator that the substantial increase in the expenditure for armaments which he recommends would not be more advantageous to the public interest than to his interest. It is true, he might admit that the outlook abroad was unclouded. But what of that? He would point to the magnitude of our commerce, and tell us that it was well worth paying at the rate of a pound a head of every man, woman, and child amongst us—every year—in a time of peace—if only as a sort of insurance-money. In all this he might be very conscientious, but it would be well for us, as the payers of the tax, to ask whether this system of insurance was not wholly delusive—whether, when we had got bulldogs into good fighting condition only for the proud satisfaction of displaying the breed and warning-off intruders, they might not be terribly apt to fly at the throats of our neighbours' similarly-trained bulldogs without first taking us into their confidence?

The truth is—each man, once he is placed in a privileged position, is very apt to be subject to a peculiar class of delusions—most of them related to a self-complacent belief that that will be best for other people which is especially good for himself. The danger is tremendously aggravated when a large proportion of those who have the making of our laws, and are in a position to profit personally from abuses in government, occupy their seats as legislators, not by any process of selection, human or divine—not because of any proven patriotism and ability on their part—but solely because they

are their fathers' sons. Our Government is beneficently ordered on the principle that there are numerous exceptions to the law that grapes may not be gathered from thorn-trees. It is ordered on the principle that a fool becomes a wise man when we put a coronet on his forehead and a robe on his back, and agree among ourselves to call him a born law-maker.

The human infirmities of which we have spoken, whereby the best of men are apt to become bad judges of what is good for other people, being taken into account, it will be seen that there can be no such effectual corrective to abuses in government as may be derived from a system which is intelligently democratic. By that we mean a government in which men are not merely content with knowing that they have power, but strive to use their power, and use it well—a government in which each looks after the business that concerns himself, subject, of course, to the Divine obligation of at the same time loving his neighbour as himself. The intelligent democratic politician is, after all, the true Individualist; he goes the right way about things to determine how much of governmental interference he will put up with, or how little. He at least knows very well that if he leaves law-making to kings, hereditary legislators, lawyers, railway directors, fighters, and bishops, and in simplicity of heart goes about his "own proper business"—art-criticism, cork-cutting, or whatever it may be—the at first invisible cords of governmental abuse will be so ingeniously wound round him that his individualism will in time be a minus quantity, and he will be bound in the meshes of oligarchic tyranny.

Of course, we do not mean to say that democratic government is necessarily good government. We do not forget that "while Caliban is Caliban, though you multiply him by a million, he'll worship every Trinculo that carries a bottle." As the democracy is, so will the democratic government be. But the ideal must always be the democratic government. On the whole, there is less fear of an intelligent democracy going wrong or coming irretrievably to grief, than a government of one-man or one-class power. The democratic State may, like the life-boat, capsize, but so long as the democratic idea possesses individual minds throughout that State, marvellous self-righting properties will be displayed. The basis is right. Mishaps and mistakes there may be. If a community, like individuals, has to learn by experience and profit from its own errors, what of that? This surely is safer and better than that the community should be helpless from the lack of freedom to govern itself, and that, owing originally to indifference or any other cause, its well-being should be at the mercy of a few fallible persons quite as prone to error as the mass, and capable of submerging the mass by their folly.

The more we look at the question, the more we must have faith in

the democratic principle. If the selfish autocrats, who are always decrying and interfering with its operations, would stand aside and allow it a fair trial, the result would be entirely good the whole world over.

It would not, however, be enough that autocrats, big and little—emperors and Tory squires and parsons—should abstain from hindering democracy. It is necessary that each unit in the democracy—each man and woman, for all suffer from bad government, and are benefited by good government—shall be, as far as possible, an intelligent unit and an active unit. To rear a good building, you want more than a good foundation and good materials. You want a skilled architect, and honest builders. The foundation of your building and the materials may be the best, but for the use of these things there must be strength, intelligence, and, above all, honesty, if the result of the work is to be good. We cannot be strong, intelligent, and honest units in the State, well able to appreciate our duty to our neighbours and ourselves, unless we are strong, intelligent, and honest politicians. We do not go so far as to say that we should all strive to have statesmanly attainments fitting us for the actual framing and administering of laws. There is just this much of truth in Mr. Ruskin's comment, that we must leave this executive business to those who ought to be best fitted for it. What we have to do, however, is to make known, with the best intelligence we can, what our wants are. We have to watch that there is no stupid or selfish avoidance of executive duties on the part of those who undertake to perform those duties. And—if we can do no more—we can at least exercise the few ounces of brain that Heaven has blessed us with, to see that the men who go to Parliament in our names and on our behalf are men of cleanly life and honest purpose.

This is our answer to the question why workmen should be politicians?

We are aware that it by no means follows that, because a workman should be a politician, he should be a Liberal politician. It is, however, our opinion that he should be such.

Broadly speaking, workmen should be Liberal because historically and practically the force most allied to the struggles and aspirations of the wage-earner in this country is the force of Liberalism. Whatever party-leaders have accomplished for the wage-earners has been due to the strength of that force. Even Conservative yielding to Democratic demands has been the result of a Liberal progress which has made such a policy inevitable. This is as true now with regard to the various advances of the Tory Democrat as it was of Sir Robert Peel's adoption of Free Trade, or Mr. Disraeli's Franchise Extension.

We do not, however, propose to discuss the traditional relations of the Liberal party to labour interests, and the peculiar claims

which the Liberal party has to this respect. The subject has been dealt with time after time by able speakers and writers. We wish to enter upon less familiar ground. When, in the present day, we take up the question of workmen and politics, we are first struck with the fact that not only are many workmen utterly indifferent in the matter, but that many workmen who are the reverse of indifferent, but are, indeed, very lively and earnest specimens of politicians, are lukewarm as to their relations with Liberalism—are, as politicians, so very lively and so very earnest that they want a party all to themselves—a Labour party.

In most cases the workman-advocate of a Labour party is an ardent Trades Unionist. Trades Unionist organizations, as such, have studiously endeavoured to maintain an attitude of separation from political parties. The first and chief cause of this is the generous desire of Trades Unionists to unite *all* workmen under their banner. Many of the leaders may feel that, in the accomplishment of objects dear to the wage-earners, a stage must sooner or later come with regard to every measure when use will have to be made of party machinery, but, finding in their ranks men of diverse party sympathies and prejudices, they hope to minimize the risk of offence and disruption by an outward profession of a non-party spirit.

There is also amongst certain Trades Unionists an honest scepticism as to the efficacy of existing party machinery. The indebtedness of the labour interest to Liberalism in the past is admitted, but there is a vague feeling that Liberalism has done its work, and that we have reached a state of things in which at bottom the difference between the Liberal and Tory leaders is but the difference between tweedledee and tweedledum; that on both sides there is a greater disposition to use the people for purposes of personal profit and aggrandisement, than to promote wise government.

This feeling is much more general than the leaders of Liberalism have any conception of. It is, indeed, sad that such a feeling should exist, though more sad that it should exist with some show of reason. The workman who year by year observes the wrongs of his class, who year by year gives his political support to this or that politician, in the hope that those wrongs may be remedied, is to be pardoned if he yields to scepticism when he reflects upon the paltering way in which the Legislature sometimes deals with social questions, especially where the interests of land or of capital are in any degree involved. There is, indeed, much to be said in excuse of the Trades Unionist, when he cries, "A plague on both your houses," and when he makes it his aim to form a grand united Labour party such as may swamp and overpower orthodox Liberalism and Toryism alike. But he may be mistaken in his policy and method, for all that.

We are convinced that the readiest, and, at the same time, the safest and most orderly way of accomplishing sound reforms will be found in the earnest and thorough utilization of existing party machinery, and in a sensible and firm determination to co-operate with one or other of the two great political parties. We base this view mainly upon a belief in the natural and orderly origin of the two great party divisions that prevail amongst us.

In all countries where representative government exists, the distinctions of Liberal and Conservative sooner or later assert themselves. The more stable and continuous any representative system of government may be, the more marked these distinctions become. This is true with regard to our Colonial Legislatures; it is true with regard to Germany, and also with regard to France. In the latter country, owing to the many governmental changes of recent times, political interests have become greatly mixed. But, despite the existence of many groups, it is easy to discern in the Republicans, the Socialists, and their allies, that class which in French thought corresponds with our own Liberal party. On the other hand, in the would-be restorers of the Napoleonic or the Bourbon régimes we may see the class corresponding with our own Conservative party. The sections of the class may be at variance, but in the adoption of the Monarchical or the Imperialist principle, and in all those views of heredity in the ownership of property and the enjoyment of privilege which the Monarchical principle typifies, they are essentially a Conservative party.

If we turn to the United States, we find two great parties—Republicans and Democrats. If names always signified qualities, it would not be easy to distinguish Liberalism and Conservatism in these two. The names, however, are entirely misleading.

Writing in 1884 upon the subject of party divisions in America, Mr. Henry George said—"The difficulty which Englishmen find in identifying American party divisions with those that obtain here arises in large part from the dislocations produced by the anti-slavery struggle. The natural political division in every country is that to which the existing division of parties in England somewhat vaguely conforms—Conservative and Liberal, the defenders of special privilege, and the advocates of equal rights, or, as it has been put, the adherents of the House of Have, and the adherents of the House of Want. This division showed itself in the United States upon the conclusion of the War of Independence. On the one side were those who desired the establishment of a strong Government, and which in their extremes wished as closely as possible to copy the institutions of the mother country. On the other side were those who feared concentration of power in a Central Government, and who, in their extremes at least, were imbued with the doctrines of human equality, then making rapid headway in France. The American Constitution,

which preserved the local sovereignty of the States, and guarded the liberty of the citizen by a Bill of Rights, whilst establishing an independent Central Government, and which in President, Senate, and House of Representatives copied the British King, Lords, and Commons, was the result of their compromises. These two parties were at first known as the Federal and Anti-Federal parties, the most distinctive leader on the one side being Alexander Hamilton, the father of the American Protective system, and on the other Thomas Jefferson, the drafter of the Declaration of Independence. The Anti-Federal party, under the lead of Jefferson, assumed the name of Republican, a name which was some time later discarded for that of Democrat. The Federal party, pushed from power by the election of Jefferson to the Presidency at the fourth Presidential election, afterwards re-appeared as the Whig party, whose distinctive principle was the fostering of American industries by a protective tariff."

The "dislocations produced by the Anti-Slavery struggle" need not here be explained in detail. Suffice it to say that in recent years there has been somewhat of a hodge-podge of party relations. Broadly speaking, there are now simply two great divisions—Republican and Democrat. Though it would be difficult to draw a clear distinction as to principle between them, there are evidences that we are approaching a crisis in the affairs of the United States when the division will be very marked. Underneath the struggle of Republican and Democrat, an agitation on social questions is going on which is likely to bring about a great split in both the existing parties, and give rise to a party of social progress corresponding to our Liberal party, and a party of caution or of retardation corresponding to our Conservative party.

The more this subject is looked into, the more it is seen that Liberalism and Conservatism are not the outcome of accidental and arbitrary distinctions, nor of local causes. They proceed from the general constitution of the human mind and from the natural play of human interests. We may rest assured that, whenever a body of men assemble to deliberate upon affairs of common concern, the relative proportions of generosity, courage, faith, and wisdom in each one of them will determine the character and the result of the deliberations of the whole. Name them by what name you will, some will be Conservative and some Liberal; some for slow progress, some for quick progress; some will view the question at issue primarily as it concerns themselves *minus* the rest of the community, some will view it as it concerns themselves *plus* the rest of the community. So far as we are allied by training or sympathy to the one or the other of these sections, we must act accordingly. We efface ourselves so far as we refuse to act with either; we increase our own power, and the power of others, by co-operating with those to whom we are most nearly allied.

Our Trades Unionist friends, to all appearance, have never taken this view of the problem of their relation with political parties. If, however, they are to determine their steps wisely and well, they must go down to first principles; they must have some other standard to guide them than that of scepticism with regard to party leaders. It is not enough for them to say that party leaders have hitherto been all too Conservative where the interests of labour have been involved. What they have to observe is that in the life of the nation at large there must always be a real and inevitable play of Liberal and Conservative forces, and that in neglecting to assume their rightful attitude of declared sympathy for the one or the other, men ignore the facts of human experience, and close their eyes to the ordinary conditions of human life and progress. They practically stultify themselves whilst refusing the co-operation of those best able to co-operate with them, and who, at the same time, need their help.

Trades Unionists, who are now Trades Unionists first and Liberals afterwards, or not at all so far as outward profession and action go, must know that scattered throughout the Liberal and Radical organizations of the land are thousands of earnest men who would gladly co-operate with the wage-earners for the attainment of social reforms, but to whom Trades Unionists, *qua* Trades Unionists, deny the advantage of such co-operation. From this cause the political force of the masses, which is for the most part Liberal, lacks the concentration which it needs.

Trades Unionists sometimes reply, "Let such men come in with us." Many of these men, however, are not technically qualified to do anything of the kind. They are, many of them, not members of Trades Unions, and they could only co-operate, therefore, as outsiders. So far, moreover, as they feel the strength of such arguments as we have advanced, they would rightly say that there would be a loss of needful influence and power in such a step. There is no political object which Trades Unionists aim at which Liberalism does not embrace, together with much else besides; there are many objects in Trades Unionism which are not political in their character. The right view, therefore, seems to be that, whilst Trades Unions should develop themselves to the utmost for the attainment of all those objects which are peculiar to themselves, they should not fail to seek co-operation where it can best be found for the attainment of those objects which, though near and dear to the wage-earners, only concern them in common with the nation at large.

So far as it is objected that the open alliance of Trades Unions and Liberal and Radical organizations would lead to difficulty, owing to the presence of so-called Conservative workmen in the existing Unions, we have to reply that not only are such men notoriously few in number, and the least intelligent amongst Unionists, but that the

disadvantage in this respect would be slight compared with the increased power which Trades Unions and the party of progress might mutually wield for the attainment of their common rights. Moreover, in practice, the non-party character of Trades Unionism is a snare and a delusion. Men of both parties insidiously strive to pull the strings. The non-party profession is associated with a great deal of intrigue and humbug, and occasionally the most startling political resolutions are come to.

Why not be thorough? Better would it be for political progress if, as Trades Unionists, these friends of reform would eschew politics altogether, confining their operations to the regulation of labour disputes and the organization of mutual relief, than that they should be continually dabbling with political questions, whilst ignoring those party relations and that party machinery, without which there can neither be co-operation amongst reformers, nor that speedy attainment of political objects which is needful. By taking this course, they would, at least, relieve themselves from self-imposed limitations. As Trades Unionists they might be neutral in fact, as well as in name; as politicians, they could freely appear for what they are. Being for the most part Liberals, they would no longer seem to deny their political faith!

We can well imagine some of the more astute of our workmen friends replying that in the political world there are enormous advantages in people playing for their own hand, that the past results of the efforts of workmen to secure labour representation through the agency of Liberal organizations have not been satisfactory, that the present state of affairs is exceptional, and that it is necessary that some very special effort should be made to limit the undue exercise of power by landlords, capitalists, lawyers, fighting men, and the rest, in the councils of the nation. We can but reply that there is no reason why workmen should not get all the direct influence they are entitled to through the medium of the ordinary Liberal Association, the so-called caucus. The caucus itself must be made democratic; and it is folly to neglect any opportunity of doing good work in that direction. A caucus should not simply provide an effective means of marshalling the electors for electioneering purposes, the drill being strictly based on the convenient teaching that they must shut their eyes and open their mouths and take what their leaders give them, and that to behave reverently towards their political betters is their chief duty. All this is wholly alien to the true spirit of democracy—it should be wholly alien to the Liberal caucus. The truly democratic organization begins with the enunciation of the elementary truth that the rights of man go before the rights of property. And, since there is no man, however poor he may be in this world's goods, who has not a stake in the national well-being; since, indeed, the poorest man, to

whom acts of government (for instance, an ill-regulated fiscal policy, or an unjustly aggressive policy in foreign affairs) may make all the difference between comparative comfort and privation, has, in one sense, the *greatest* stake in the national well-being, the aim of democratic organization should all the more be to enable *his* voice to be heard. Beginning from the very basis of society, the basis of the wealth producers and workers, the democratic organization will seek to give every man an equal right *in the selection*, as well as in the election, of a Parliamentary representative.

It is perfectly patent that a true representation of the people is not secured when they are merely called upon to vote for the candidate submitted to them by the heads of their political party. When the time for election comes, the personal objections of the electors to the candidates submitted count for little—only Hobson's choice is left them. We should like to change all this; and workmen would be wise if they were to assist in the work. We should refuse to accept any electoral association or caucus as truly representative until every member, by test ballot, or some kindred expedient, had a voice in the selection of the candidate to be run. And the candidate thus selected having been carried in the constituency, and sent to Parliament, the electors should still exercise a strong control. If they send a man to Parliament for a particular purpose, they have a right to see that he remains faithful to his duty. The right to criticise and control is the logical outcome of the right to elect or to reject.

No doubt, if we followed this subject up to the full, we should have much to say as to universal suffrage, and the payment of members and of election expenses. We believe that the interests of all, and the highest good of each, so far as they can be influenced by Parliamentary representation, require universal suffrage and the payment of members and of election expenses. Against this, it may be said that such views as we have enunciated would, if carried into effect, swamp the "intelligence, cultivation, and property" of the country. For our part, we believe that, were manhood suffrage and the payment of members given to-morrow, intelligence, cultivation, and property would well be able to take care of their legitimate interests, and we should still have to keep a sharp look-out lest they took an undue care of their illegitimate interests also. It could not well be otherwise. Before the Franchise Bill of 1885 was passed, was it not the common belief of the Radicals that, when the franchise was extended to agricultural labourers, "property" would be found to have taken such very good care of itself that a great Conservative triumph, the result of the power which "property" exercised over unintelligent minds, would follow? That was a sacrifice for which Radicals felt it their duty to be prepared, knowing that the political education of the agricultural labourer could not well begin until the power to exercise political rights was given to him,

and until all parties acquired an interest in appealing to whatever intelligence he possessed, and in calling forth his latent powers. In their anticipation the Radicals were not far wrong. In the first election on the extended franchise Mr. Gladstone did fairly well in the country districts, but he could not be said to have "swept" those districts. The fact was "property" had a very good start in the party-political race, and succeeded in keeping it up to the finish. It was surely from no small faith in the ultimate acceptance of their principles that, notwithstanding the start they knew the Conservatives would have, Liberals believed that they would ultimately come up in the race with the "cultivation, the intelligence, and the property" of the Conservative party.

Really and truly, all this talk about swamping "the intelligence, the cultivation, and the property" of the country is very pitiful. It is all based upon that clever political fiction that the franchise makes all men equal at the polling-booth—as though the poor man and the ignorant man do not vote as "intelligence, cultivation, and property," embodied in the lords and masters of the community, may influence them. We may trust that an intelligent use of the franchise, sooner or later, follows its acquisition, but until intelligence is imparted, the poor and ignorant man, with the franchise, or without it, must equally be the tool of the men who pull the political wires in the interests of a spurious cultivation and intelligence which over-rides many of the common rights of humanity, all for the sake of maintaining the supremacy of property over much that is truly intelligent, cultivated, and humane. The anomaly of the existing state of things is not that "intelligence, cultivation, and property"—the latter more particularly—have had too little, but rather that they have had too much representation. We would give every man the power to vote, in order that flesh and blood, which have hitherto been too much the tools of "intelligence, cultivation, and property," might assert a right to representation also—might, in short, the better assert a claim to the consideration of "intelligence, cultivation, and property," and make this triumvirate more truly the friends of the nation at large, and not agents for class-legislation. "Flesh and blood," however, as embodied in the toiling masses, cannot be brought up to this point without a universal franchise and payment of members.

We trust that politicians generally, and workmen in particular, will consider their duty well in all the aspects of it to which we have referred. There is great room for an enlarged political wisdom, for increased political zeal, for sincerity, for thoroughness, and for a more intelligent understanding of party relations and party obligations.

Of course, we do not advocate extremes in politics, any more than we should advocate extremes in the use of alcoholic stimulants. Just as a man may be pious, and not try to prove his piety by burning heretics, a man may be a Liberal without acting illiberally and proving

his zeal for human well-being by the exhibition of intolerance. The intemperance of party politicians has done much to bring politics generally into contempt, and to prevent the co-operation of sober-minded men in political work. Let us frankly confess that there is a sense in which it has truly been said that "party is the madness of the many for the gain of the few." Those words of Edmund Burke had a severe application at the time of their first utterance, and many a time have they been exemplified since in political struggles. There have been times when the craze of partisanship has elevated that round which for the nonce it has gathered into a moral juggernaut, under which the fanatical believers themselves have been maimed or destroyed. It has sometimes even happened that this madness of party has caused men of ability and influence to place themselves at the head of some craze of the hour, of the falsity of which they may not themselves have been wholly ignorant. Such men might feel aghast at the Satanic assumption, "'Tis better to reign in hell than serve in heaven," yet, so far as they sacrifice the love of truth to the passion for power, they subscribe to the sentiment. Men of this class rarely succeed in converting the world to their own views, but whilst they flourish they are as mischievous in the field of politics as nettles are in a flower-garden. Locally, they are often represented by those small bodies of crotchet-mongers, whose chief delight at election times is to harass candidates for the people's suffrages in a way that makes the coveted seat in Parliament a dearly bought dignity. It is often hopeless to attempt to convince such men of the intemperance of their action, but it is advantageous to the public weal that they should be easily discerned of the multitude, and that we who profess to be sober-minded politicians should freely declare that we have no sympathy for their methods, and that, in our opinion, the spiritual, intellectual, or social happiness of men can only be wisely secured by the temperate advocacy of reforms based on grand and broad principles, and especially upon that principle of love to the neighbour which is the negation of selfishness and bigotry.

Yes, love to the neighbour. How very much hangs upon that. It is the "open sesame" to individual, social, and national progress. The very mention of this reminds us that there is yet another class of workmen besides the Trades Unionist workmen, whom we may soon have to encounter when we contend in favour of workmen being *Liberal* politicians. This is our friend the Socialist. He is hardly a party yet; he tells us he is the coming party—the only growing party. We have no time to discuss that; when he has come, we shall be glad to have a talk with him. All we would say now, is that, at their best, the doctrines of Socialism are but a re-statement of the doctrines of democracy, and that there is ample room for their inclusion in Liberalism. The truth of Socialism is embraced in the clear perception that man is by nature a societary being—that it is as a

society, and not as individuals merely, that men must progress or decline. And what is this but the teaching of enlightened Liberalism? Not less than the Socialist does the Liberal declare that the progress of society is governed by the condition of the individual, and that the progress of the individual is governed by the condition of society.

Eighteen hundred years ago, a Galilean prophet informed an evil and adulterous generation that the law and the prophets hang on the simple precept—"Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and thy neighbour as thyself." He spoke an all-embracing truth. It is our duty to aid, from a scientific and philosophical as well as a practical standpoint, in the reception of this precept, not merely in religion, but in politics, in the State, and in society.

The law and the prophets hang on the precept of love to God and to man, because of the homogeneity—the essential unity of things. In the spiritual sphere the unifying power is love. It is love which, descending from the highest to the lowest, and rendered back from the lowest to the highest, is the principle of life and activity in every plane of existence, spiritual, moral, and natural or physical. Departure from love involves disorder, or loss of life. Perfect life is perfect unity—perfect love. Grasp this thought, apply it in all its deep significance, and then the force and beauty of the great truth which Socialism borrows from Christianity, but which many Socialists do not know how to rightly apply, will appeal to us from its scientifically accurate standpoint—the progress of society is governed by the condition of the individual, and the progress of the individual is governed by the condition of society. In very truth we are "all members of one body."

"We hold these truths to be self-evident—that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; and that, whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter, or to abolish it." Such are the words of the Declaration of American Independence. They point to that form of State Socialism in which at least we may all believe; but which we say is but a re-statement of Liberal doctrine. Let us inscribe them in letters of gold. And let us also put beside them the words of Condillac: "To preserve oneself, to be happy, is instinct, right, and duty. But, to be happy, you must contribute to the happiness of others; if you wish them to be useful to you, be useful to them. Be good, because goodness links hearts together; be gentle, because gentleness wins affection; be citizens [and, I will add, be politicians], because a country is necessary to ensure your safety and well-being."

HENRY ROSE.

THE LIFE OF LORD JOHN RUSSELL.¹

THE Nineteenth Century in England is pre-eminently, as it has often been called, the epoch of reform; and of all reforms, the most important, and that which contains in itself the source of all others, is the extension of political power to the masses of the community.

This great change was not accomplished all at once. It took three stages before it could be regarded as reasonably complete; and, even now, there is still much to be done in this direction. In all such questions, however, the first step is the most momentous; when it is once taken, the others will inevitably follow. And this being so, a perpetual debt of gratitude is due to the men who first led the way in the path of progress, and to none more so than to the statesman whose name will for ever be associated with the first and most famous of Reform Acts. These words will suggest at once to all who have any knowledge of English History the name of Lord John Russell, whose life is contained in the two volumes before us. His biography has been somewhat long-delayed, but it could hardly have fallen into better hands than those to which it has been entrusted. Without any disparagement of others who have undertaken a like task, it may, without hesitation, be affirmed that no work on the History of England during the present century equals in value the five volumes in which Mr. Spencer Walpole has told in detail the story of the forty years which succeeded the Battle of Waterloo. Every reader of his pages must have regretted that he has stopped short at the point where his history ends, and it is to be hoped that we may yet have the story of the succeeding thirty years told with equal fulness by the same pen.

Meanwhile, we give a cordial welcome to the present volumes as a further instalment of their author's services to historical literature.

The life of one who lived so long, and who played for many years so prominent a part in public affairs as Lord Russell, might easily, if told on the scale of some much-less-important biographies, be extended to eight or ten volumes at least. Mr. Walpole has, however, wisely made no such demand on our patience. Some may think that he has erred in the other direction of undue compression, and that his subject would well have borne another volume; but the

¹ *The Life of Lord John Russell.* By Spencer Walpole, Author of a *History of England from 1815.* In two vols.

fault, if it be one, is certainly on the right side, and there is little reason to grumble either at the quantity or quality of what he has given us. He does not, like too many biographers, devote a disproportionate amount of space to his hero's earlier years. A few extracts from his diaries, when he was a pupil at Westminster School, and afterwards at a private tutor's, are given. These selections are well chosen, and, as he says, "give a picture of a delicate and sensitive boy entering with zest and courage into pursuits for which his strength is hardly equal; backward in his studies, but precocious in his knowledge; thrown by his birth and connections into occasional intercourse with the first men of the day, interested in politics, fascinated by the stage; and, in all that he did and all that he wrote, displaying honesty and truth."

His school is truly described as a "rough place," and the following edifying anecdote, recorded by the future statesman, affords us a glimpse of the code of morality adopted by its pupils. "Being placed in the under-school, I at once became a fag, and, as such, was directed by some of the boys to direct the glazier to mend a window which was broken. Two days afterwards, as the glazier had not appeared, the same boys asked me whether I had given him the order. When I said, 'Yes,' they rejoined: 'Did you swear at him?' I said, 'No.' 'Then go and swear at him.' For a little boy, this was not a very good lesson."

His life, after leaving school, was more agreeable. He was sent to the house of Mr. Smith, the Vicar of Woodnesboro, near Sandwich, whom he describes as "a very worthy man, well acquainted with classical authors, both Greek and Latin, but without any remarkable qualities, either of character or of understanding." His tutor was, of course, a good Whig, and showed his political sympathies in a way which would hardly find many imitators now. On the formation of the Talents Administration in 1806, "he gave his Whig pupils a whole holiday to celebrate the return of the Whigs to power." How his Tory pupils fared, or whether he had any, is not stated. Lord John's father, the Duke of Bedford, was a member of the new Ministry, and the keen interest of his son, Lord John, in politics is considered by Mr. Walpole to date from the occasion of his father becoming a Minister. The Cabinet was only destined to be short-lived. The insane bigotry of George III., a sovereign whom people are still found to praise, caused him to take fright at the very moderate advance in the direction of religious liberty shown by the proposal to allow Catholics to hold commissions in the army, a concession already granted in Ireland. The Ministers were dismissed, the Tories came into power, and a general election followed, which was carried mainly on the "No Popery" cry. "Every Whig was called a Papist," notes Lord John, in his journal. Even the new Ministers themselves were a little ashamed of the prejudices by which they had

profited. "At the meeting of Parliament, the Ministers disowned the cry. Mr. Perceval alone said that it was the general cry of the people, and must be well founded." The principle of "*Vox populi, vox Dei*," could hardly be put more broadly than it was when thus enunciated by one of the most narrow-minded and reactionary of Tories. Yet in this he was but a type of many of his party even in our own day, who, while determined foes of all the reasonable political aspirations of honest working-men, are not ashamed to appeal to the lowest passions of the most degraded sections of the community. Even at the moment we write, in Wales, certain leading Conservatives, while resisting to the death the demands of the Welsh people for the Disestablishment of a foreign Church, and for Land Law Reform, offer them, instead, the liberty of unlimited Sunday drinking.

Lord John completed his education, not at an English University, but at the University of Edinburgh—a very unusual thing for a gentleman at that time. This step of his father's was certainly a wise one. At that time, as the Duke truly said, "Nothing was learned at the English Universities, while the intellectual activity of the northern capital contrasted favourably with the torpor which, unfortunately, characterized too frequently the course of study at Oxford and Cambridge."

His stay at Edinburgh lasted from 1809 to 1812. During his vacations, and after the conclusion of his academical studies; he made several visits to the Continent. While abroad in 1813, he was, while still under age, elected for his father's borough of Tavistock. During one of his Continental tours he had an interview with Napoleon, at Elba, in December 1814, of which he gives the following account: "He was dressed in a great coat, with a hat in his hand, very much as he is painted. He appears very short, which is partly owing to his being very fat, his hands and legs being quite swollen and unwieldy; that makes him appear awkward, and not unlike the whole-length figure of Gibbon the historian. Besides this, instead of the bold-marked countenance that I expected, he has fat cheeks, and rather a turned-up nose, which, to bring in another historian, makes the shape of his face resemble the portraits of Hume. He has a dusky grey eye, which would be called vicious in a horse, and the shape of his mouth expresses contempt and derision. His manner is very good-natured, and seems studied to put one at one's ease by its familiarity; his smile and laugh are very agreeable. He asks a number of questions without object, and often repeats them, a habit which he has no doubt acquired during fifteen years of supreme command. To this I should also attribute the ignorance he seems to show, at times, of the most common facts. When anything that he likes is said, he puts his head forward and listens with great pleasure; but, when he does not like what he hears, he turns

away as if unconcerned, and changes the subject. From this we might conclude that he was open to flattery, and violent in his temper." Lord John Russell was in Italy when Napoleon returned to France. In that country the feeling was decidedly in his favour. "Napoleon is respected by all. Of course, there is a party for and a party against him, but I believe the former are the strongest." Nor was this without reason. Infinitely as Europe, as a whole, had suffered from Napoleon's selfish ambition, in Italy his rule had certainly been an immense improvement on the previous state of things, and was far superior to the infamous governments to whose mercy the Congress of Vienna consigned the ill-fated land. It was doubtless his Italian experiences mainly which led Lord John to take the course of protesting in the House of Commons against England's participation in the new war, which he declared to be "impolitic in its origin, unjust in its object, and injurious in its consequences." There was certainly something to be said for this view of the case; but those were probably right who contended that, with Napoleon at the head of France, Europe could hope for no enduring peace; and England should be blamed, not so much for joining in the war, as for not vigorously opposing the reactionary proceedings of her allies after the victory was gained. The years immediately succeeding the Peace were by no means cheerful years in England. The distress and misery among the lower classes were such as the worst period of depression in our own day can give only a faint idea of. Political discontent was naturally engendered, but its manifestations were harshly repressed by the tyrannical measures of about the worst Government which this country has known since the downfall of the Stuarts. The Habeas Corpus Act was suspended, public meetings were practically prohibited, and the law of treason had been so extended, that a mere trivial act might be brought within its provisions. In short, "law and order" of the most approved Balfourian type reigned in England.

Lord John Russell protested against this abominable tyranny in a manner worthy of the martyr of freedom whose blood ran in his veins. In words which well deserve attention, he remarked that "the Habeas Corpus Act had been enacted at a time when a plot had been discovered, which, though it has since been mentioned only as an instance of credulity, bore at the time a most alarming appearance. No less than two hundred persons, many of them of the first rank, were accused of conspiring the death of the king. The heir presumptive to the throne was supposed to be implicated in the conspiracy, and foreign powers were ready with money and troops to assist in the subversion of our Constitution in Church and State. Yet at this time did the Lords and Commons present for assent that very Bill of Habeas Corpus which, for less dangers, you are now about to suspend. We talk much—I think a deal too much—about

the wisdom of our ancestors. I wish we would imitate the courage of our ancestors. They were not ready to lay their liberties at the foot of the Crown upon every vain or imaginary alarm." Such a system of repression could only be maintained by a Parliament which did not really represent the popular feeling. There is no need to describe in detail the constitution of the unreformed House of Commons. The tale has been told often enough, but it may be briefly stated that, before the Reform, half the members were practically nominated by a few individuals. The single county of Cornwall, which now has but one borough entitled by its population to a representative, then had about twenty wretched villages dignified by the title. Most of these had been created in the Tudor period, for the express purpose of introducing a servile class of members into the popular House. Corruption, intimidation, and every kind of undue influence ran riot in these bogus constituencies. One of the most scandalous cases of gross and continual bribery was that of the Cornish borough of Grampound, and it was in connection with it that Lord John Russell first took up the question of Reform. In 1819 he moved for the disfranchisement of the borough, and appended to his motion a series of resolutions affirming the advisability of depriving all corrupt boroughs of the right of returning members, and transferring their share of representation to large towns and counties. The matter came up for two succeeding years, and in 1821 Lord John achieved a qualified success. Grampound was disfranchised, and its members were assigned to the county of York. He failed, however, to carry his general resolutions, and he did not meet with any better fate when he again brought them forward in 1823.

His first conspicuous success was achieved, not in the direction of parliamentary reform, but of religious liberty. In 1828 he moved the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, and, to the general astonishment, carried it against the Government by a majority of forty-four. This paved the way for Catholic Emancipation, which the election of O'Connell for Clare forced on the Wellington Ministry in 1829. Meanwhile, the Reform question had cropped up again on the occasion of the disfranchisement of the corrupt borough of East Retford. The Whigs wished to give the seats to Manchester or Birmingham, but the Tory Ministry succeeded in transferring them to the adjoining hundred of Bassetlaw, and thus the curious fact came about that an immense rural area in Nottinghamshire enjoyed the borough franchise previous to the extension of the franchise to the counties in 1885. The time was fast approaching, however, when all such paltry tinkering with a great subject was to cease. The death of George III., in 1830, was followed by a general election, in which the Tory party were so much weakened that their fall from power soon followed, and the Whigs were in office for the

first time since 1807. Lord John Russell took office in the new Ministry as Paymaster of the Forces, but was not in the Cabinet.

It was felt, however, that the work of introducing the measure of Reform, which must be the first task of the new Government, could not be entrusted to better hands than those of the man who had been the champion of the question for so many weary years of Opposition. Upon Lord John, accordingly, devolved the conduct of the first Reform Bill in the House of Commons. There is no need to enter into the well-known details of the struggle, but an extract from his speech in bringing forward the Bill for the first time is worthy of quotation, as it furnishes the key-note of this and all subsequent contests for an enlarged representation. "You must show that you are determined not to be the representatives of a small class or of a particular interest; but to form a body who, representing the people, springing from the people, and sympathizing with the people, can fairly call on the people to support the future burdens of the country, and to struggle with the future difficulties which it may have to encounter; confident that those who call upon them are ready to join them heart and hand, and are only looking, like themselves, to the glory and welfare of England."

Before the passing of the Act in 1832, Lord John had been promoted to Cabinet office as a well-merited reward for his indefatigable services in carrying the measure through the Commons.

The first Reformed Parliament had soon to turn its attention to the perennial difficulty of English statesmen—to the question of Ireland. The agitation against the tithes paid to the Protestant clergy was assuming alarming proportions; the collection of these imposts had become, over the greater part of the country, well-nigh impossible, and a great increase of crimes of violence was the natural result.

The Grey Ministry was not in all respects fortunate in its Irish policy. A bad selection of a Chief Secretary had been made in Mr. Stanley, whom Mr. Walpole truly describes as "a man whose abilities qualified him to shine in almost any capacity, but whose temperament made it certain that he would fail to conciliate the Irish." And, most unfortunately, no practical step was taken to carry the Emancipation Act into effect. All the subordinate posts in the Irish Administration were filled up by Protestants; and the Prime Minister and most of his colleagues looked with horror upon the idea of attempting to cultivate friendly relations with O'Connell and the Irish popular party. They proceeded, as their first measure, to introduce a Coercion Act of surpassing stringency, which was carried through Parliament by large majorities. It failed, however, as might be expected, either to allay discontent, or even to make the collection of the tithes any easier.

The Ministry had been apparently of one mind in their repressive

measures ; but, as soon as reforms for Ireland were proposed, dissensions arose. The proposal to appropriate a portion of the surplus revenues of the Irish Church to other than ecclesiastical uses led to the withdrawal of Mr. Stanley and his followers from the Government. A further difference of opinion ensued on the question of renewing the Coercion Act, which resulted in the resignation of Lord Grey in August 1834. The short-lived first Administration of Lord Melbourne followed. The circumstances of its downfall were such as closely concerned Lord John Russell. The succession of Lord Althorpe, the leader of the House of Commons, to the peerage had created a vacancy to which the Prime Minister and his colleagues wished to appoint Lord John. The King, however, strongly objected. He had told Lord Melbourne, ten months before, that he "could not bear John Russell," and now "His Majesty stated, without reserve, that he [Lord John] had not the abilities or the influence which qualified him for the task, and observed that he would make a wretched figure when opposed by Sir Robert Peel and Mr. Stanley." His Majesty had further objections. He considered Lord John Russell to have pledged himself to certain encroachments upon the Church which his Majesty had made up his mind, and expressed his determination, to resist. The result was that "the King, exercising his personal authority in a manner which the Sovereign of England has never since employed, dismissed his advisers and sent for the Duke of Wellington."

A general election followed, in which the supporters of the new Ministry gained largely, but not enough to place them in a majority. As leader of the Opposition in the early part of 1835, Lord John Russell had a delicate task before him. He was "unable to bring a majority into line without combining Whigs, Radicals, and Irish in one common movement." The Whig leaders had not yet quite overcome their prejudices against any association with O'Connell ; only a few months before, Lord John, himself, had protested against overtures being made to him, and yet it was evident that the support of the Irish leader was necessary if the Tory Government were to be displaced. These unwise prejudices were, however, overcome, and a meeting of all sections of the Opposition was held at Lichfield House, at which a common basis of action was agreed upon. It was decided that battle should be joined on the question of the Irish Church, and an amendment was proposed by Lord John to the Tithe Commutation Bill, introduced by the Government, affirming the desirability of appropriating the surplus revenues of the Protestant establishment to purposes of general education. The amendment was carried, and the Ministry resigned. Lord Melbourne returned to power, with Lord John Russell as Home Secretary. On this occasion he lost his seat for South Devonshire, and was obliged to take refuge in the small borough of Stroud.

The new Cabinet had many difficulties to contend against. They had only a small majority in the Commons, were helpless in the Lords, and the King was openly hostile to them. "William IV. abhorred all his Ministers, but hated Lord John the most of all. The monarch's only interval of pleasure was during the Devonshire election, when he was delighted at John Russell's defeat. With these opinions the King not merely used his influence to oppose the policy of his Ministers, but treated them for many months after they first took office, both in public and private, with a discourtesy which is hardly credible. He declined to give any dinner-parties, because he could not do so without inviting them, and he declared that he would rather see the devil than any one of them in his house." With all these drawbacks, however, the Government managed to do some good work in the first year of office. The great measure of Corporation Reform, only second in importance to the Reform Bill itself, was carried through the Commons by Lord John. The Lords, after their wont, made destructive amendments, but most of these were rejected. The only one of importance which was accepted was the unfortunate provision introducing aldermen into the new corporations.

With their Irish measures the Ministry were less fortunate. They carried a Tithe Bill with a clause for appropriating the surplus Church revenues through the Commons, but the Lords rejected it, and the same fate befell an Irish Municipal Bill on the lines of the English Act.

What could not be done in legislation was, however, as far as possible, carried out in administration. The old fatal anti-national traditions of Dublin Castle were discarded, the Emancipation Act became, for the first time, a reality, and friendly relations were cultivated with O'Connell. Lord John had, by this time, so far overcome his prejudices as to desire that the Irish leader should be promoted to office on the formation of the Ministry. "I was quite willing," he said, "to renounce office for myself if he thought his exclusion was an injustice which he would be disposed to resent. O'Connell, in the handsomest manner, declined to put forward any pretensions on his own part, and expressed his wish that I should take a leading part in the Administration."

Their Irish policy was undoubtedly the most honourable part of the conduct of the Melbourne Government; but it was also the subject of the most vehement attacks from their opponents. On this subject especially; but not only on this subject, they were exposed to the peculiar vein of scurrilous denunciation, not resting on any basis of honest conviction, which is so dear to the baser part of a Tory Opposition, and of which, since the period we are now treating; Mr. Gladstone's two Administrations have furnished the most conspicuous examples. A specimen of these detestable vulgarities, so characteristic

of the "gentlemanly" and "educated" Party at every period, may be given from the writings of the great saint whom his worshippers honour every year with floral tributes. In a series of epistles, styled "The Runnymede Letters" (thus was the memory of the sacred spot which gave birth to the great charter of English freedom desecrated by the champion of abuses), Mr. Disraeli reviled in the choicest Billingsgate every member of the Ministry. Of Lord John he wrote as follows:—"Your aim is to reduce everything to your own mean level, to degrade everything to your malignant standard. Yes, my lord, when he learns that you are the leader of the English House of Commons, a stranger may begin to comprehend how the Egyptians worshipped—AN INSECT." These elegant remarks found an appropriate place in the columns of the *Times*. Mr. Walpole must surely be sarcastic when he says that "the reader accustomed to the careful manner in which the *Times* is edited now, is surprised that that paper should have stooped to insert them."

The death of William IV., in July 1837, appeared an auspicious event for the Ministry, which was relieved from the unpleasantness of his personal hostility, and could rely on the favour of the new sovereign.

They calculated on gaining in the general election which was rendered necessary, but their hopes were not exactly fulfilled. In Ireland, indeed, the people showed their gratitude for two years of just government by unseating several Tories; but in England the balance of advantage remained with the Opposition, and the Government majority was lessened on the whole. Their increasing weakness was strikingly shown in the dropping of the Appropriation Clause, and the passing of the Tithe Bill without it in 1838. This surrender was deeply regretted by Lord John Russell, but he felt it to be inevitable. It was hopeless to expect the Lords to give way, except to a great outburst of popular feeling, and, to the disgrace of the English people, no such manifestation of opinion could be expected in favour of a measure of justice to Ireland. As Lord John put it:—"The people of England never took up warmly the Appropriation Clause." It might have been supposed that the Irish, in their disappointment, would have blamed the Government and have withdrawn their support from it; and, indeed, a people with a far less amount of unreasonableness and ingratitude in their character than the inhabitants of the sister-isle are often credited with, would certainly have done so. O'Connell, however, was wiser and juster. "I wish with all my heart," he wrote, "that the Ministry were decently freed from the dilemma of the Irish Tithe Bill, with its troublesome Appropriation Clause. It is really too bad to risk, on such a point, a Ministry who are, for the first time in history, conquering the anti-Saxon spirit of Ireland, and adding eight millions to the Queen's subjects."

The Irish Corporation Bill was again rejected by the Lords in 1839, and at last passed in a very mutilated form in 1840.

The latter year was a critical one for the Melbourne Ministry. To their domestic difficulties were now added serious foreign complications, and the muddling foreign policy of Lord Palmerston, too little controlled by the Prime Minister, brought the country to the verge of a stupendous calamity—a war with France. The Foreign Secretary succeeded in committing the Government to embark in the futile and absurd task of bolstering up the decaying fabric of Ottoman despotism, and to give material support to the Turkish Sultan against his rebellious vassal, Mehemet-Ali, the Pacha of Egypt. A quadruple alliance was formed between Great Britain, Austria, Russia, and Prussia, for the purpose of compelling the Egyptians to submit to the Sultan's authority. France, which sympathized with Mehemet-Ali, was not consulted in these arrangements, and her natural irritation very nearly caused the outbreak of a serious European war. Lord John Russell strongly disapproved of the policy which had involved England in such a dangerous position, and expressed his views very strongly in the Cabinet in opposition to Lord Palmerston. He had even at one moment determined to resign, and resist to the utmost a war with France. "If war is impending," he wrote, "I shall be in a position to oppose and, I think, to prevent it. The Whig party, I think, would be with me in such a case." Fortunately, however, a peaceable settlement was arrived at, and Lord John withdrew his resignation. This episode in his career is not generally well known, but, perhaps, no portion of that career is more honourable to him than his resolute determination to resist, at any cost, a war which he rightly believed to be both unjust and unnecessary.

In 1841 the Government was manifestly tottering to its fall. It was several times defeated in the House of Commons, and at last Sir Robert Peel carried a direct vote of want of confidence. The general election which followed gave the Tories a large majority, and the Peel Ministry came into power. As regards English measures, it showed itself at least as reforming as its predecessors; but to Ireland the change was a fearful calamity. The wise and just administration, which had in a few years almost reconciled the Irish people to the Legislative Union, was a thing of the past, and the old evil traditions of Protestant ascendancy once more held sway in Dublin Castle. O'Connell renewed the Repeal agitation, which he had suspended under the Melbourne Administration, and it soon attained dimensions which alarmed the Government, and caused them to resort to annoying, but ineffectual, measures of coercion.

Even now, however, O'Connell was not absolutely determined to be content with nothing short of the Repeal of the Union; and, while he was actually the subject of an unjust and vindictive prosecution

by the Government, he thus, in a letter to Mr. Charles Buller, a prominent Liberal member of Parliament, formulated his ideas as to the "measures which would be satisfactory to the Irish people. I am not telling you what would satisfy me personally, but I will tell you what I know would deprive me of many of my present adherents—what I think would mitigate the present ardent desire for Repeal. Firstly, establishing perfect religious equality, which could be done in either of two ways: the one would be the paying all religious instructors of Catholics and Episcopalian Protestants; the second way—the right one,—the paying neither clergy. Secondly, to restore the law of landlord and tenant to the state it was in at the time of the Union. There have, since the Union, I think, been seven statutes passed, enhancing the landlord's power of distraint and eviction. Thirdly, the county franchise is becoming totally extinct. The basis must be extended to the people at large. Fourthly, the Corporate Reform Bill for Ireland should be made equally potential with the Corporate Reform for England and Scotland. Fifthly, our town constituencies should be rendered more extensive, and the old freemen (an ancient political nuisance) should be abolished. Sixthly, the income-tax upon Irish absentees should be increased fivefold. Seventhly, the question of fixity of tenure should be taken into the most deliberate consideration."

The moderation of these proposals will not be denied; most of them have since passed into law; but, as the Irish leader truly said, "The British people will think of doing justice to Ireland as they did to America—when it is too late." He was, however, hardly fair when he added, "The Whigs won't do it: the principal part of them will necessarily be under the control of Lord John Russell, and he will never permit anything like justice to be done to the Catholic people of this country. I know him well. He has a thorough, contemptuous, Whig hatred of the Irish." Lord John soon showed the injustice of this accusation by a motion which he made on the state of Ireland in February 1844. In his speech he put forward a programme of Reform substantially identical with the suggestions of O'Connell, and the following portion of his remarks is, unfortunately, as true to-day as when it was first uttered:—"In England the Government, as it should be, is a government of opinion; the Government of Ireland is notoriously a government of force." During the course of the debate a pleasing incident occurred. "On February 15th, Mr. O'Connell, fresh from his trial before a packed jury in Dublin, entered the House, and was received with rounds of applause from the Liberal benches. Lord John shook hands with him, and the great Irish agitator, who, only a month before, had declared that nothing was to be expected from Lord John, said to him: 'I thank you for your admirable speech; it makes up to us for much that we have gone through.'" The motion was, however, rejected by the

brute force of the Tory majority, and affairs in Ireland went on from bad to worse, till the failure of the potato-crop filled to the brim the cup of miseries of the ill-fated Irish people.

This calamity at once brought to the front the question which had for years been making steady progress through the persevering labours of its advocates—the Repeal of the Corn Laws. Lord John saw at once that prompt action was required in such an emergency, and, in November 1845, he addressed his celebrated letter to his constituents of the City of London, declaring himself fully converted to the principles of Free Trade. “Let us unite,” he said, “to put an end to a system which has been proved to be the blight of commerce, the bane of agriculture, the source of bitter divisions among classes, the cause of penury, fever, mortality, and crime among the people.” Scarcely had these words been written when their author was called upon to form a Ministry, owing to the unexpected resignation of Sir Robert Peel when he found himself unable to carry his Cabinet with him in repealing the Corn Laws. Lord John set about his difficult task with commendable energy, but his efforts were doomed to failure, owing to the refusal of Earl Grey to sit in a Cabinet in which Lord Palmerston held the office of Foreign Secretary. Sir Robert Peel consequently resumed office, with his Cabinet somewhat altered, and pledged to a Free Trade policy.

The Repeal of the Corn Laws was carried, and was almost immediately followed by the defeat of the Government on an Irish Coercion Bill by a coalition of Protectionists and Liberals. The former, of course, were influenced simply by a desire for revenge; the action of the latter hardly needs any defence now. Lord John Russell was once more called upon to form a Government, and, this time, he met with more success than on the previous occasion. His position, however, was scarcely a bed of roses. The ever-recurring Irish difficulty had now become more urgent than ever in the face of the pressing needs caused by the famine. It cannot be said that Lord John’s administration of Ireland was altogether successful, though we fully recognize the goodness of his intentions. On this point it is well to remember that Mr. Walpole, fair-minded as every page of his writings shows him to be, is yet, as a biographer, bound to make out the best case possible for his hero. His narrative should be compared throughout with the extremely moderate and eloquent statement of the case from the point of view of men of the Irish Nationalists of the period, indicated in Sir Charles Gavan Duffy’s *Four Years of Irish History*.

Mr. Walpole defends the conduct of the Russell Ministry in not prohibiting the exportation of corn from Ireland during the famine—a measure which was advocated by Tories as well as Nationalists at the time. He says, “It would have been of no advantage to have retained, for the use of the Irish, the cereals which they had raised

for export, unless it could be shown that no cheaper kind of food could be obtained elsewhere." But this assertion leaves out of sight the fact which constituted the peculiar aggravation of the people, seeing the abundant corn harvest they had reaped carried away to England while they were left to starve. The fact was it had become the custom for the value of the grain crop to be taken as rent by the landlord, while the peasants had to content themselves with the potatoes. What ought surely to have been done in the face of the exceptional circumstances created by the famine was to have suspended an arrangement which was surely, in its essence, a very hard bargain at all times; the corn crop ought to have remained the property of the cultivators so long as the blight on the potatoes lasted. This, of course, would have amounted to a cessation of the payment of rent during the famine; and all who have any feelings of common humanity will admit that it would have been better that a few landlords should be a little pinched in pocket rather than that thousands should die of starvation; especially when it is borne in mind that the landlords, as a class, had for nearly two centuries been robbing their tenants of the value of their improvements under the protection of the law.

Again, the inhuman evictions by which the miseries of the famine were so fearfully aggravated ought certainly to have been put a stop to by the Government, which, while peremptorily refusing aid to carry them out, ought to have applied to Parliament for a sanction of their action. It can hardly be believed that the English people, who were certainly full of sympathy for their Irish brethren in their distress, would not, if they had known only a tenth part of the infernal doings of the ever-accursed "Crowbar Brigade," have heartily supported a summary check on its proceedings.

Lord John Russell did not adopt the bold and strong measures which alone were fully adequate at such a crisis; but, still, considerable allowance must be made for him. He was certainly in advance of most English statesmen of his time in his views on Irish questions. When the atrocities of the landlords had produced as their inevitable consequence a great outburst of crimes of violence, the Prime Minister showed a most honourable reluctance to have recourse to "the ever-failing and ever-poisonous remedy of coercion," which was pressed on him by many of his colleagues, and especially by the Irish Viceroy, Lord Clarendon. "A mere suppression," he wrote to the latter, "of the violent symptoms of a disease, which has continued from 1876 to the present time, is an aggravation rather than a cure of the social disorder. It satisfies the landlord class, and they are thereby encouraged to worse atrocities than before." He was at last almost forced by the general clamour in England to introduce a measure which was mild in comparison with most previous, and many subsequent, Coercion Acts. Mr. Walpole has

effectually disposed of the charge of inconsistency and unscrupulous party spirit brought against the conduct of Lord John in overthrowing Sir Robert Peel's Government on the Coercion question and subsequently bringing in a similar measure. "Whether Lord John was justified in giving Lord Clarendon increased powers or not, it is certain that the powers which he gave him were widely different from those which Sir Robert Peel had demanded in 1846, and to which the Whigs had chiefly objected. They did not contain any provision for compensating the victims of outrages at the expense of the ratepayers; they did not render persons congregated in public houses or carrying arms liable to arrest; above all, they did not comprise the brutal clause which made persons out of doors at night liable to transportation."

Lord John was resolved not to resort to repression unaccompanied by reform. "I am not ready," he expressed himself to Lord Clarendon, "to bring in any restrictive law without at the same time restraining the powers of the landlord. It is quite true that landlords in England would not like to be shot like hares and partridges by miscreants banded for murderous purposes; but neither does any landlord in England turn out fifty persons at once, and burn their houses over their heads, giving them no provision for the future. The murders are atrocious; so are the ejectments. The truth is, that a civil war between landlords and tenants has been raging for eighty years, marked by barbarity on both sides." In pursuance of these views, a Bill giving the tenants compensation for their improvements was introduced in the Session of 1848. With the usual ill-fortune of Ireland, however, the Coercion Bill went rapidly through Parliament and passed into law, while the measure of relief failed to get through the Commons. The Irish, naturally enough, were greatly aggrieved, and gave rather a disproportionate share of blame to the head of the Government, who, as his biographer says with truth, was "a generation before his time."

The abortive insurrection of 1848 naturally led to further repressive measures for Ireland. Lord John Russell was, of course, not directly responsible for the shameless manner in which juries were packed by the Irish executive to secure convictions of the Nationalist leaders, still less for the conduct of Lord Clarendon, who, as is recorded by Sir Charles Duffy, refused to order the removal of political prisoners from a prison in the most disgusting and insanitary condition. Still, however, it is painful to think that such things could have taken place under the administration of such a sincere friend of justice and freedom.

If Lord John was not able to pass any great measure of reform either for Ireland or England, it was not for want of the will to do so. He succeeded in completing the work of Free Trade by the repeal of the Navigation Laws, and again took in hand the ques-

tion of Jewish Emancipation, which he had many times advocated before, and which now seemed doubly incumbent on him, as his colleague in the representation of the City, Baron Rothschild, was prevented from discharging his duties to his constituents by the barrier inadvertently erected in 1829. A measure of relief easily passed the Commons, but was as usual wrecked on the rock of the obstinate bigotry of the Lords. Lord John announced the event to his wife in the following curious specimen of Latin, of which the canine character is, of course, intentional:—"Sabbat, Maii 27. Malus sum. Non tibi scripsi hesterno die. Gaudeo salute tua et prolis nostræ. Dies natalis Reginae et concilium Cabinetti me constringit hodie ut non possum te videre usque ad noctem cras dies festivus et sanctus. Gaudeo non plus scribam. Panes Judæis infesti, populus infestus Paribus, faciunt caldarium piscium bellissimum."

It would be an interesting exercise for the youthful student to correct the numerous deviations from classical purity contained in these few lines.

Lord John was anxious to pass a measure for the extension of the franchise, and thus to carry on the work he had begun in 1832; but he encountered considerable difficulties in his Cabinet, and it was not till the last days of his Ministry that the Reform Bill saw the light, and the events which speedily followed prevented it from going beyond the first reading. For by this time the continual friction created by Lord Palmerston's conduct of affairs at the Foreign Office had led to the break-up of the Government. The Foreign Secretary, as he had done in 1840, continually took the most important steps without consulting his colleagues or the Queen. Lord John had several times remonstrated with him, but had only met with haughty and defiant answers, till at length he was compelled to remove his refractory colleague. No Liberal will doubt that, in the matter which led to the final step being taken by the Premier, Lord Palmerston was entirely in the wrong. His previous lapses from the customary rules of diplomacy were to a large extent condoned by advanced Radicals, as they were in the direction of displaying sympathy with revolutionists and hatred of despots; but, in 1851, he expressed to the French Ambassador his approval of one of the most abominable and treacherous acts of tyranny ever committed—the *coup d'état* by which Napoleon III. obtained power. The Cabinet had decided to maintain absolute neutrality with regard to the internal affairs of France, and, much as had already been put up with from Lord Palmerston, it was impossible to tolerate conduct of this sort. He was most properly requested to resign, and it is humiliating to think that one who had so acted as he had done on this occasion could ever have been regarded as the leader of the Liberal Party. His resignation,

however, proved a fatal blow to an already weakened Ministry. It was shortly afterwards defeated in the House of Commons, on an Amendment moved by Lord Palmerston to the Militia Bill, and retired from office in 1852.

The short-lived Ministry of Lord Derby followed, which was overthrown before the close of the year by the coalition of Peelites and Whigs, which came into power under Lord Aberdeen. Lord John Russell, feeling that a man who, after being Prime Minister, accepts a subordinate office, is placed in a very difficult position, and one liable to much misconstruction, was unwilling to enter the new Ministry. He yielded, however, to the entreaties of many of his political friends, and made what was certainly a great sacrifice of his personal inclination to the public good, in accepting the leadership of the House of Commons, with a seat in the Cabinet, but without any particular office. The name of the Government which was thus formed will for ever be associated with the unfortunate Crimean War, of which it may be said that, while few wars have been so popular at the time, hardly any have been proved by after-events to have been so thoroughly unjust and unnecessary. Mr. Walpole's opinions on the question have been stated with sufficient clearness in his *History of England*, and are manifest enough in the present work. He does not conceal the fact that Lord John must share, to the full, the responsibility for the policy which led to the war. Indeed, from the first he belonged to the party in the Cabinet, of which Lord Palmerston was the most prominent representative, who were determined to support the Turks against Russia, while Lord Aberdeen doubted the necessity or wisdom of such a course. However, it must be recorded to his credit that he did not share the ridiculous illusions as to the virtues of the Turks which were so prevalent at the time; still less was he committed to the detestable doctrine that, while we were bound to support them against Russia, it was no concern of ours how they treated their Christian subjects.

"We must act," he wrote, "not for the Sultan, but for the general interests of the population of European Turkey." But hardly any of those who were foremost in urging on the war had any thought for those interests. Lord John had by no means given up his convictions of the necessity for the enlargement of the representation, and, in spite of the imminence of war, he succeeded in persuading the Cabinet to consent to the introduction of a Reform Bill in the session of 1854. None, however, of his colleagues were at all enthusiastic in support of the measure; even those who were in favour of its principle thought the time inopportune, while Lord Palmerston was so strongly opposed to it that he was with difficulty prevented from resigning. And, after the actual outbreak of hostilities, Lord John was reluctantly prevailed upon to agree to the withdrawal of the Bill. His earnest wish was to retire at the same

time from the Cabinet, but he remained in deference to the entreaties of the Prime Minister. His position had now become very awkward. He differed frequently from his colleagues on questions connected with the conduct of the war; and when, in the early part of 1855, Mr. Roebuck brought forward his famous motion for an inquiry into the military administration, Lord John felt that he could not honestly resist it, and at length tendered his resignation. He, again against his better judgment, consented to enter the first Ministry of Lord Palmerston, which succeeded to the Aberdeen Cabinet, and accepted the post of British Representative to a Conference, which was to assemble at Vienna, to endeavour to bring about the pacification of Europe. At this Conference proposals were made by the Austrian Government, to the basis of which Russia assented. The chief point in dispute was the question of the Black Sea, from which England and France desired to exclude all Russian warships, while the Austrian Minister "contended that the object could be secured by a counterpoise, or, in other words, by authorizing the Allies to maintain in the Black Sea a force equal to that kept up by Russia." Lord John, though he did not regard the Austrian proposition as perfectly satisfactory, yet thought, and surely now few will differ from him, that if Russia were willing to accept it, there was no sufficient justification for continuing the war. He accordingly expressed himself in its favour in various confidential interviews in Vienna, and had reason to believe his colleagues at home would support his action, though he was placed in a position of some difficulty by the absence of detailed instructions from them. The French Representatives also appeared to be in favour of the Austrian solution of the problem, and there seemed every prospect of a peaceful settlement, when suddenly everything was changed. The cause of this untoward alteration of the state of affairs was a sufficiently disgraceful one. It was the determination of the man who had climbed to power by the treacherous massacre of his own countrymen to shed yet more of their blood and that of foreigners in the pursuit of his selfish ambition. The French Emperor feared that his hold on the army would be weakened if he allowed hostilities to cease before some more striking victories had been won than had been won as yet. He accordingly determined to reject the Austrian proposals; and Lord Palmerston, with that subservience to a foreign tyrant which was the worst feature in his public career, thought the alliance of Napoleon III. must be maintained by England at any cost. The negotiations were therefore broken off. Lord John, unfortunately, consented to surrender his own judgment, and to remain in a Cabinet which was committed to a policy of which he disapproved. He even defended the action of the Government in Parliament. There can be no doubt that he was influenced by no unworthy motives, but was taking a course which was certainly

not agreeable to him, in the honest belief that he was thus best serving his country. It is to be regretted, however, that he did not see that the best service he could render to England at this juncture would have been to do as he had resolved to do in 1840, and resist at all hazards an unjust war. His position soon became very unpleasant when, not long after his speech in the House of Commons, a circular was issued by the Austrian Minister making public the fact that the English and French Representatives had expressed themselves in favour of the Austrian proposals.

"The publication of this despatch raised a storm of obloquy such as few public men have ever encountered. How, it was asked, could Lord John reconcile his conduct at Vienna with his language in Parliament? If it were true that he thought that the terms of Austria were reasonable, why had he not redeemed his promise and advocated them in the Cabinet? Why, at any rate, was he still a member of the Government which had refused them?—and why was he urging the vigorous prosecution of a war which he, himself, thought ought to have been concluded?" It cannot be denied that there was some ground for the charge of inconsistency; but there was certainly no excuse whatever for the gross personal abuse which was now showered on Lord John's head by nearly the whole Conservative and, to their shame be it said, by a large portion of the Liberal Press. But the madness of the war-spirit had temporarily deprived too many both of reason and common fairness. Lord John felt that he could hardly remain in the Cabinet under these circumstances. A motion had been brought forward in the Commons reflecting on his conduct, and it was very doubtful whether it could be successfully resisted. His colleagues were prepared to stand by him, but he determined to relieve them of the burden by withdrawing. "Contrary to his own opinion, Lord John had remained in office for the sake of imparting strength to the Administration: he would not remain another hour when he found that the Cabinet had become a cause of weakness to it." In July 1855 he sent in his resignation to Lord Palmerston, and for the next four years he enjoyed a very welcome freedom from the cares of office.

During this period of retirement he honourably distinguished himself by opposing Lord Palmerston's attempt to change the laws of England in obedience to the insolent threats of a perjured foreign tyrant. On the introduction of the Conspiracy Bill, in 1858, he spoke strongly against it, concluding with the following words:—"Let those who will support the Bill of the Government; in that shame and humiliation I am determined not to share." His name is to be found in the list of the majority which rejected the Bill and overthrew the Government. During the tenure of office by the second Derby Ministry, Lord John had the satisfaction of seeing the question of the emancipation of the Jews, which he had long striven

for, at last settled; and his colleague was enabled at length to take the seat to which he had been elected eleven years before.

In the early part of 1859 the Conservative Ministry attempted to pursue Mr. Disraeli's favourite policy of "dishing the Whigs," by the introduction of a so-called measure of Parliamentary reform. "Lord John would have welcomed a good measure of reform from any source; but he was determined to accept reform from no source which did not proceed on what he thought sound principles." And a very short glance at Mr. Disraeli's Bill was enough to show that it was simply an ingeniously contrived scheme to strengthen the Tory party. "It did nothing to bring the franchise down to the level of the working classes," while it foisted on the boroughs the non-resident property voters who, even at the present time, are such a drag on the electorate in many countries. Lord John carried a resolution against the principle of the Bill on its second reading, and the defeat of the Ministry was immediately followed by a dissolution of Parliament. The Government gained to some extent by the new elections, but they were still in a decided minority, and it was evident that they could only retain office by the divisions of their opponents.

Negotiations were entered into between Lord John Russell and Lord Palmerston for the purpose of re-uniting the Liberal party, which proved successful. The Ministry were overthrown on a vote of want of confidence, and Lord Palmerston's second Cabinet was formed, in which Lord John held the office of Foreign Secretary. He accepted this post at a very critical moment. The great struggle which resulted in the liberation and union of Italy was in active progress, and it was largely owing to the Foreign Secretary that, while England preserved neutrality, her influence was thrown steadily on the right side. As Mr. Walpole puts it, the watchword of Lord John's policy was, "Italy for the Italians." He still hoped to see a measure of Parliamentary Reform carried, and in 1860 he introduced the third Bill he had proposed since the passing of the Act in 1832; but it met with no better fate than its predecessors. Nearly half the Cabinet were averse to it; it was very doubtful whether it could be carried through the Commons, and the country was lukewarm on the subject. The Bill was withdrawn, and the question slumbered for five years more.

In the following year Lord John was raised to the peerage by the title of Earl Russell. The duties of his office now involved him to some extent in the issues arising out of the great conflict which was raging on the other side of the Atlantic, and it must be admitted that, during the earlier stages of the American struggle, his views were not much more accurate than those of the majority of English at the time. He supported Lord Palmerston's plan of mediation in 1862, "with a view to the recognition of the independence of the Confede-

rates." This preposterous scheme fortunately came to nothing, owing to the wise opposition it encountered in the Cabinet from Lord Granville. The sudden death of Lord Palmerston, in 1865, caused Lord Russell to become Prime Minister for the second time. It was felt by all that the first work of the new Ministry must be the introduction of a fresh Reform Bill. The Cabinet, however, was by no means agreed as to the details of the measure: many of its members wished to water it down to such a degree as would have made it of little value; but Lord Russell, supported by Mr. Gladstone, succeeded in overcoming the timidity of his colleagues. "The Bill which was thus proposed, and which contemplated the reduction of the county franchise from £50 to £14, and of the borough franchise from £10 to £7, and the enfranchisement of lodgers, would have added, if it had passed, a considerable number of voters to the electorate." It soon became evident that such a measure was far too wide for the House of Commons. The celebrated secession from the Liberal party took place of the group of members whom Mr. Bright happily entitled the "Cave of Adullam," and who were the true prototypes of the "Liberal Unionists" of our day:

The second reading was passed by a majority of five only; the further stages of the Bill encountered a persistent obstruction, and, at last, a destructive amendment was carried, which led to the resignation of the Ministry, and terminated Lord Russell's official career. There had not, up to this time, appeared many signs of popular interest in the Reform question; but no sooner did the Tories come into power than all was changed. "In one sense Lord Russell was amply vindicated. The breeze of popular feeling, for which he had vainly waited since 1849, freshened after his fall into a gale. The apathy of Southern England ceased with his resignation. Before a month was over the railings of Hyde Park had given way to the pressure of a mob; men of all parties were aroused to the conviction that reform was a subject to be treated, and not to be trifled with; and in 1867 a Conservative Administration brought forward a larger and more comprehensive measure of reform than any which Lord Russell had ever contemplated. Thus, though it was not given to Lord Russell to be the author of a second Reform Act, the passing of a second Reform Act vindicated his prescience and proved the truth of his principles."

The last twelve years of Lord Russell's life, from his retirement in 1866 to his death in 1878, do not present many points for special notice. It must be admitted that some of his appearances in public during his old age hardly added to his fame. It was unfortunate that such a great champion of religious liberty should have allowed himself to be associated with a movement to express sympathy with the repressive measures of Prince Bismarck against the German Catholics. The last cause, however, of which he made himself the

advocate in public, was one worthy, indeed, of his earlier achievements—the defence of liberty in Eastern Europe. It must ever be recorded to his honour that while many Liberals were uncertain how they should regard the insurrection against Turkish tyranny in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and some of them were willing to lend an ear to the ridiculous assertion that the men who were contending against enormous odds for everything that is dearer than life were merely the tools of Russian intrigue, “Lord Russell threw himself with ardour into the cause of the insurgents,” and even did not shrink from sending them aid in money. His biographer justly claims for him that he “had been the first prominent man in England to realize the great issues which were inseparably connected with the insurrection; and throughout 1876 he watched, with never-failing interest and horror, the progress of the movement and the atrocities with which it was met. Yet his own declining health made it impossible for him to emerge from his retirement and take part in the fray.” In fact, his death occurred before the struggle was, for a time, concluded by the Treaty of Berlin. Yet this last portion of his career is not without instruction for the present time, when the demons of Turkish savagery are once more let loose in Crete and Armenia, and when, as in 1876, we have a Tory Minister pooh-poohing the best-authenticated reports of unspeakable atrocities. In truth, Lord Russell’s foreign policy, though it must fill a rather secondary place in a summary of his life, was as honourable to him as any part of his public conduct. His voice was almost always raised on the side of justice and freedom, and, with the one unfortunate exception of the Crimean War, in opposition to the needless shedding of blood. The firmness which he displayed in 1840 did much to save England from an unjust and calamitous war with France; and if he was in error in supporting the Crimean War at its commencement, he made some amends by his readiness to accept reasonable terms of peace in 1855.

It is, of course, however, in his achievements in domestic politics that his fame will chiefly rest, and he will ever be remembered for his services in the causes of religious liberty and parliamentary reform. On the former question, it is sufficient to refer to the repeal of the Test Act and the emancipation of the Jews; and the record of his life will have told his continual strivings for the enlargement of the representation. It cannot be said that in his later years he was quite as advanced on this subject as his younger colleagues in the Liberal party. As Mr. Walpole says, he “lived to see younger men push his principles to extremes which he had never contemplated, and which he did not wholly relish.” All his various proposals were framed on the model of the Act of 1832, and he seemed more anxious to amend any casual defects in that measure, or to extend its operation a little further, than to devise a large and

comprehensive scheme of Representative Reform. Yet all honour is due to the pioneer of a great movement; and though he would probably have considered that the changes which have been made since his death have gone too far, rather than not far enough, yet we should do the most real service to the memory of a great man by carrying on his work to its logical conclusion. And much yet remains to be done before we can boast that we have a Parliament which thoroughly yet represents the nation. Even now, the proportion of voters to population is far less in England than in France and the United States, and no true Liberal can rest satisfied with such a state of things. The present laws of registration practically disfranchise a large proportion of the working classes. Especially is this the case in London, where, if the exigencies of his daily occupation compel a man to move from one quarter of the metropolis to another, he loses his vote. The result is that at least one-half of the toilers of London have no voice in the election of its representatives—a state of things which, if not remedied, may easily lead to serious consequences before long. There can be no doubt that the feeling of London is utterly misrepresented at present, with its fifty Tories against twelve Liberals; and though it may confidently be affirmed that the next election will see a great alteration, yet even then it is doubtful whether the real opinions of the masses will be at all adequately represented. It is certain, in fact, that if the working men of London had had their due political rights London would never have returned a Tory majority. Those fatuist Unionists who congratulate themselves so complacently on the Conservative temperament of the masses of the English metropolis, as compared with the ultra-democratic views of the population of the French capital, forget altogether that if the proportion of the population enjoying the franchise in London were the same as is the proportion in Paris, instead of 500,000 electors in London, there would be at least 1,000,000: where would four-fifths of its Tory members be then?

Of the personal character of Lord Russell nothing can be said but in praise. Mr. Walpole's picture of his home-life is a very pleasant one, and he thus remarks:—"A great authoress has told her readers that it is better sometimes not to follow great reformers of abuses beyond the threshold of their homes. But if this be true of other men, it is emphatically untrue of Lord John. It is precisely to Lord John's home that every biographer of Lord John who understands his business must desire to take his readers." An agreeable story will show the relation in which he stood to his servants. "In the autumn of 1888 his youngest daughter took her old nurse to a lecture on Mr. Carlyle. The lecturer excused his domestic hero's troubles by declaring that it was natural that great men, whose minds were absorbed by public anxieties, should be sometimes irritable and impatient at home. And the old nurse, who had only known one great man, ex-

pressed her indignation that any one should suppose that great men were not great in their home-life." No one would claim for Lord Russell that he was the equal of Carlyle in genius, but he certainly contrasted with him as favourably in his personal disposition as in the soundness of his political principles.

Opinions may differ as to his title to be admitted into the small circle of really great men ; but it may with truth be said that few equally long public careers have been as honourable, as consistent, as full of successful labours for the benefit of the great body of the people as that of the statesman who may well be called the father of parliamentary reform in England.

THE LABOUR QUESTION IN AUSTRALIA.

FROM AN AUSTRALIAN POINT OF VIEW.

THE sympathy shown, and the feelings manifested, in Australia, on the subject of the dock-labourers' strike in London, have served to bring under a new aspect the labour question on this side of the globe. Young and sparsely populated as the Australian Colonies are, some of the problems connected with supply and demand, in regard to labour, which have so continually presented themselves in older countries, have, from time to time, made their appearance here. The tendency to crowd into large towns, which is so noticeable a characteristic of modern social life, has not been without its effect in Australia; and, as a natural consequence, has led, at times, to a considerable congestion in the labour market, especially in regard to unskilled-workmen employments. Perhaps in no city in Australia has this condition of congestion been more manifest than in Sydney during the last few years. Many causes, the principal of which were the temporary cessation of important Government works, in the shape of the construction of lines of railway, and a succession of more than usually dry seasons, combined to induce an influx of the labouring-classes into the metropolis. As a natural result, congestion in an aggravated form followed, and the spectacle was seen of some hundreds of men out of employment. This state of things occurred at a time when the New South Wales Government was expending a yearly sum in assisting immigration. And, curiously enough, as each shipload of immigrants arrived, the dépôt set apart for their accommodation, pending their dispersement over the country, was besieged by would-be employers, willing to pay high prices for their services. The demand for male labour, it is true, was not so great as for female, in the form of domestic service, yet men, especially married men used to farm-work, readily found employment on farms and stations. Still more curiously, at the time some hundreds of men were without employment in the metropolis, employers of labour in many of the country districts were experiencing a difficulty in procuring what they required.

Instead of returning to the country in search of work, the unemployed collected together and marched through the streets. To

look at them, they appeared merely a number of comfortably-dressed, able-bodied, and certainly not ill-fed men, marching gaily along, with banners waving and flags floating proudly on the breeze, and headed by a band playing inspiring, if somewhat martial, strains of music. And without noticing the device on the banners, setting forth the fact of their unemployed condition, one would have been inclined to the belief they were setting out on a pleasure-excursion, or demonstrating for some purpose of a pleasurable character.

Open air meetings in convenient and conspicuous localities followed, and deputations organized to wait upon certain members of the Ministry. The result was that a paternally-minded Government charged itself with the task of providing work for those out of employment, with its necessary concomitant in the form of wages; and, by doing so, established a precedent, the consequences of which are bound to be felt for many a day yet to come. The work provided was principally the clearing of crown lands in the vicinity of Sydney, and the making of roads which might in the course of time come to be needed. But this scheme for the amelioration of the labouring-classes, as injudicious as it was benevolent, instead of curing the evils caused by congestion, had the entirely opposite effect of increasing them, as it immediately induced a gravitation towards the metropolis of working-men, not only from the inland districts of New South Wales, but from the other Australian Colonies as well.

The wages paid by the Government were at the rate of 5s. per day; and this rate, though lower than the ordinary rates for unskilled labour, was sufficient to induce men, who were employed at better wages in places distant from the metropolis, to throw up their work, and join the ranks of those employed on the Government relief-works—the advantages of living near a large city, and the light character of the labour required, being considered as more than a set-off against the higher wages obtainable in the country. This state of things continued for some three or four years, and, though Government succeeded Government, work, much of which was of a useless character, was found for a portion of the community, which came to be recognized as the “unemployed,” and which seemed about to become one of the regular institutions of the country. Yet, away from the metropolis, many thousands of broad acres were waiting to be tilled, and many of the natural resources of the colony remained undeveloped, because of the scarcity and high price of labour. During this time the various labour organizations, in which Australia abounds, were busy adopting and putting into force rules for restricting the hours of daily labour, and for regulating the rates of wages, in order to prevent their falling below a certain minimum.

And, so successful were their operations, that, at the present day,

eight hours have become, in very many occupations, skilled and unskilled, the recognized duration of a working-day.

Willingly enough, many large employers of labour agreed to fix the working-day at eight hours, experience having taught them that, in a climate like that of Australia, a longer strain of the physical energies had a tendency to lower the capabilities of their workmen—or, in other words, they had arrived at the conclusion that, on an average, as much work, of a kind too taxing to any great extent the physical energies, could be performed in a day of eight hours as in one of ten or twelve. On the whole, therefore, the operations of the labour associations in Australia have had a beneficial effect on the condition of the working-classes, without being, on the other hand, detrimental to the interests of employers. But, in the direction of fixing the rates of wages, the results have not been of so happy a character. For, as is the case with all arbitrary regulations, whether imposed by a whole community in the form of a legal enactment, or by a portion of it, in the shape of trades-union rules, the inevitable outcome has been a considerable amount of friction between employers and employed, to the disadvantage of both. So far were the operations in favour of fixing the rates of wages carried, that efforts were made to induce the Government to increase the rate paid to the men employed on relief-works, on the ground that the rate in force tended to depreciate the value of labour—as though that value might be made a fixed quantity, in no way subject to the natural laws of supply and demand.

On this point, however, the Government had the good sense to resist the pressure brought to bear on it, and, finding in the course of time, that the relief-works, instituted through a mistaken idea regarding Governmental responsibilities, were increasing the very evils they were set in motion to cure, by attracting men from their legitimate employment, went a step further, and reduced the rate of wages to 4s. per day. This reduction, combined with the effect of a better season throughout the country, did much to reduce the number of men seeking employment at the public expense. And an exposure of the methods made use of by the Relief Board, in the expenditure of the large sums of money voted by the Government, brought the system into so much public disfavour, that an announcement was made that, after a certain date in the near future, the relief-works would be discontinued. The effect of that announcement took place during the present year, and yet, so far, there have been no signs of an approaching revolution. What is more, the state of long-continued congestion in the labour market of the metropolis is gradually yielding to the new course of treatment, and shows signs of a change towards a more healthy condition than has been noticeable for several years past. And now the condition of the labouring-classes in London, as revealed by the strike at the docks, has made it manifest

that the lot of the working-man in the Australian Colonies is by no means so bad as many people have been, of late, inclined to believe it to be. The money sent from Australia to the strike-fund did not all come out of the pockets of the wealthy classes. A good deal of it was given by working-men, either directly, or from the funds of labour associations. The ability to help others to the extent the dock labourers of London were helped by the working-men of Australia, is proof positive that the latter are in a prosperous condition. It was the sharpness of the contrast presented to the minds of the working-classes here, by the conditions which led to the strike, that aroused their sympathy, and made them not only ready but eager to help.*

Still, some of the problems connected with the economic aspects of the labour question in Australia, will, no doubt, present themselves again and again for solution, as they have done in older countries. One would need to be a very thoroughgoing pessimist, however, not to see more ground for hope in the possibility of their solution in a country like Australia than in countries where the conditions are more fixed—conditions for which the *causa causans* must be sought in the history of centuries long past. There has been exhibited a desire on the part of legislators and others to grapple with the problems which have already presented themselves for solution in the Colonies.

Naturally enough, the view taken by the working classes themselves on the subject has been in the direction of a belief that the supply has, for some length of time, been in excess of the demand. And the working-man, being somewhat of a power in the land—and, in respect to his vote, a very great power indeed,—it follows, not unnaturally, that many people have been disposed to hold a similar view. In consequence of that view, the belief became pretty general that the only and efficient cure for the evil was to restrict the supply. Hence the catchy, but somewhat senseless, cry has been raised of keeping “Australia for the Australians.” And the policy of restriction has resolved itself into a determination not only not to assist, but to discourage, by every possible means, immigration into at least the older Colonies. Yet, side by side with this determination, there has been for some years past a decided spirit of rivalry between New South Wales and Victoria, on the subject of population, and a still more decided disposition, on the part of the former, to crow over her younger rival when she had outstripped her in the race; which fact seems to afford an illustration of the possibility of the human mind to hold, at the same time, two ideas diametrically opposed to each other. Ask any ordinarily intelligent inhabitant of any of the older Colonies of Australia, if he considers the continent to be over-populated, and he will not only answer by an emphatic negative, but will most probably laugh at you for propounding such a question. Ask him, then, if he considers that immigration should be encouraged, and he will reply, “Certainly not—if you mean the

immigration of working-men ; for the country has more of them than she knows what to do with." And if he should happen to be a resident of Sydney, he would most probably add that to do so would be simply adding to the number of people for whom the Government would have to provide work.

There are, however, not wanting signs that people, here and there, are working towards the conclusion that the state of congestion in such cities as Sydney is due largely to preventable causes, and is by no means an indication that the labour market throughout the Colonies is overcrowded. But, even granting the contention that the supply is, to some extent, in excess of the demand, it does not follow that the best cure for the evil lies in restricting the supply. The same result may be obtained by increasing the demand. No one would be so foolish as to advocate the destruction of the surplus productions of a country, on the ground that they tended to lower the price below what the producer considered his rightful due. Neither could any one be found to maintain that laws should be made to restrict production within certain fixed limits, on similar grounds. Yet, to restrict the productive powers of a country, by preventing the development of her natural resources, differs from such restrictions only as regards the base of its operations. No one could possibly be found to maintain that the boundless resources of Australia are being developed as rapidly as they might be, if the population was more in keeping with the extent of her territory. Perhaps no aspect strikes the attention of a stranger, travelling in Australia, more forcibly than the paucity of settlement in the inland districts of even the older Colonies. Mile after mile, the train carries him through broad acres well capable of cultivation, without a single farm meeting his sight. If he were to leave the railway line, and travel here and there through the country, the land he would see under cultivation would bear a very small proportion to that lying idle, or overrun by the flocks and herds of the squatter.

There are other beside agricultural resources in Australia which need but the proper application of labour to become a vast source of wealth, and a means of livelihood to thousands of workmen. Besides gold and silver, Australia is rich in most of the useful metals. And in iron alone she has the elements of what must inevitably become an important industry. Work—yes, there is work waiting, ay, crying out to be done, in the island continent of Australia—sufficient to absorb a large proportion of the surplus labour of the old world.

Wonderful, considering the brevity of her history, has already been the development of her resources ; yet that development is still only in its infancy. With a fertile soil, a magnificent climate, and a thousand and one natural advantages, she needs but an adequate population to take, as a Greater Britain in the Southern Ocean, a leading position amongst the foremost nations of the world. That

position she is bound, as the inevitable result of natural conditions, sooner or later to attain—sooner, if her population increases by additions from without—later, if by the slower process of birth-rate. Are we, then, to provide the necessary population by setting wide every door by which immigrants from the overcrowded countries of the older world may come in? After a serious pause for consideration, I answer emphatically, *Yes*. But the “yes” is, nevertheless, subject to certain important qualifications. Australia needs population. That is a self-evident truth, which no man acquainted with the circumstances of the case would attempt to gainsay. But it is population that, instead of becoming a drag in the labour market of her cities, would spread itself over her broad surface, and assist in the proper development of her resources. Working-men she needs. Men of bone and muscle; men with ready, capable hands; men who will not come out with large expectations of settling down to some light occupation in a city, and amassing a fortune in the course of a few years.

She can find plenty of room for, and can give a hearty welcome to, men of that sort. She can absorb men with a fair—even a large, if you will—amount of capital, and give them a return on its outlay undreamed of in countries on the other side of the globe. But she can also provide openings for men whose chief capital consists of a pair of strong arms, a spirit of enterprise, and a mind made up to endure a fair share of the rougher experiences of life, cheered by a certain hope of more comfortable prospects in the future. For the farmer—ay, and farm-labourers too—no matter what European country he hails from, there is room in Australia.

There are other things besides grain which Australian soil is capable of producing abundantly. The grape-vine of France and Germany, the orange of Spain, and the olive of Italy each find a habitat suited to it in the new world of the Southern Seas, and with them the fruits of temperate and tropical countries, from the pear and plum to the banana and pine-apple. In the growth and preserving of fruit, an important industry is only waiting for hands to create it. Viticulture has already made considerable progress, and the success that has attended its introduction is an encouraging augury of the future awaiting that industry—a future which bids fair to make it a rival to the greatest wine-producing industries of the old world.

Hands used to the culture of the vine, or, failing that, hands willing to learn what is necessary to enable them to do that kind of work, are needed by the hundred in Australia. Men with capital would find in that pursuit, or in the manufacture of the produce into wine, a splendid means of turning it to account.

Work in Australia? Yes, there is work, and plenty of it, for those who are willing to engage in it. Next to a strong, capable-

pair of hands of his own, the best capital a man could bring with him is half-a-dozen stalwart sons, who are entirely without finicking notions in respect to soiling their fingers.

For young men, whose chief aim in life consists in "doing the block," in natty boots and cane in hand, and whose sole capabilities lie in the direction of penmanship, Australia has no room at all. Neither has she much to offer the man who wishes to come out with a view to "instruct the natives," and dispense an atmosphere of "sweetness and light" by the mere fact of his presence. Such men would inevitably "waste their sweetness on the desert air." Somehow, notwithstanding the newness of our social conditions, we have managed to raise quite as large a crop of that kind of individual as we know what to do with, even though we have a paternally inclined Government to find nice easy billets for them—besides which we have already been presented with not a few specimens from the other side of the globe. Neither for working-men who are unwilling to go out of sight of a "big smoke," does Australia show any signs of being in need. Of that kind she has, even now, far too many.

In my mind's eye I have just the class of men Australia stands most in need of. It has been my lot to spend some years in an inland district of New South Wales. And I have seen, for myself, what a strong pair of hands and a spirit of enterprise and determination can accomplish. I have watched the career of men who possessed such, and have seen what has been accomplished by a stout heart and willing hands, from a very small beginning. I have seen it, and I know. And, with land waiting to be purchased on easy terms, and a soil and climate few countries can boast the equal of, what, let me ask, can a man want more? But, some one objects, there is such a thing as drought to contend with, you know. Well, there is, at certain intervals, a period of dry weather that people have got into the habit of calling "the drought," and looking upon as something in the form of a plague, for which no man can be expected to make provision. It is, however, simply Nature's resting-time, in a climate where she has not the power to spread her mantle of snow. It may be provided for as adequately as is the much more protracted period of unproductiveness in colder latitudes.

Let the good ship set sail, then, and let it bring the man of stout heart, and willing, capable hands, and in Australia he will find a welcome and a home.

JEANNIE LOCKETT.

INDEPENDENT SECTION.

[Under the above title a limited portion of THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW is occasionally set apart for the reception of able Articles, which, though harmonizing with the general spirit and aims of the Review, may contain opinions at variance with the particular ideas or measures it advocates. The object of the Editors in introducing this department is to facilitate the expression of opinion by writers of high mental power and culture, who, while they are zealous friends of freedom and progress, yet differ widely, on special points of great practical concern, both from the Editors and from each other.]

THE NEW ROUND TABLE:

COMMUNICATIONS FROM

THE RT. HON. J. G. SHAW-LEFEVRE, THE HON. BERNARD COLERIDGE, M.P.
M.P. JOHN PAGE HOPPS.
A. BRAND WINTERBOTHAM, M.P. J. SEYMOUR KEAY, M.P.
LORD BRASSEY.

It has never seemed to me that the Tory party is precluded, either by its past history, its principles, or its self-interest, from accepting the principle of Home Rule for Ireland, or proposing a scheme for carrying it into effect. The subject is outside the range of ordinary party questions. It would be a great advantage to those other interests which the Tories have most at heart if the Irish question could be settled. Ireland, when content as regards its relations to the Imperial Parliament, would almost certainly gravitate to the Tory party. It has been from the accident of its political antagonism to Great Britain that its representatives have during the last fifty years been indispensable allies to the Liberal party in the carrying of great reforms.

It will be very different when their national aspirations are satisfied. Whether the Irish members remain in the Imperial Parliament or not, the Tory party must be strengthened in respect of all English institutions. Again, it need not be pointed out that two at least of the greatest changes in the century—Catholic Emancipation in 1829, and Democratic Extension of the Suffrage—were carried by the Tory party after long years of opposition to those measures.

It was conceivable, therefore, that after the rejection by the constituencies in 1886 of Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule scheme, the Unionist party might at once have recognized the impossibility of governing Ireland under the old system, in face of the fact that one of the two great parties in the State, and almost one-half of the electors, had committed themselves to a vital change. It might, without dishonour and without charge of inconsistency, have propounded a federal scheme to Ireland as a preferable and safer alternative to the scheme based on the colonial plan which the country had rejected. It might well have invited the leaders of all four of the Parliamentary parties to a meeting at a Round Table, to discuss the details of such a measure, and to come to agreement upon them.

The Unionist party, however, did not adopt this course, and what has since occurred has made it much more difficult for the Tory party now to execute a *volte face*. We are three and a-half years nearer to a general election, and it is certain that a surrender by the Tories to the principle against which they have declared so vigorously, would only lead to their more certain defeat by the electors; a defeat more thorough and universal than befell them after Catholic Emancipation, or in 1869.

Another difficulty is, that no measure can wisely or safely be proposed to the Irish people without previous concert and agreement with their representatives. The settlement of the Irish question, if it is to be a final, lasting, one, must take the form of a compact between the people of Great Britain and of Ireland; and, for this purpose, negotiations must be had and concert be arrived at between the Irish chiefs and the Ministers who represent Great Britain. A Round Table at which the Irish leaders are not present would be useless.

If wise, prudent, and generous statesmanship had prevailed during the past three years, if, after the rejection of the Home Rule Scheme, the Unionist party had met the Irish representatives in a conciliatory spirit, negotiations and concert with them might even now have been easy enough.

The Government might well have approached the Irish in 1886 with words of this kind: "We have rejected your demand for a separate Parliament in Dublin, but all the more we feel bound in honour to listen and defer to the demands of your representatives; we will show that the Imperial Parliament can and will do all that an Irish Parliament would do for you, and that the administration can be carried on in a spirit agreeable to Irish ideas. We will, in fact, govern Ireland and legislate for it in the same manner as we have done for Scotland." This would have been a generous course to a people whose demands for self-government had been rejected.

In lieu of acting in this spirit, the so-called Unionists have pursued

the very opposite policy. Never, since the Act of Union, has Ireland been legislated for and administered in a spirit so hostile and repugnant to the wishes and feelings of the great majority of its people. The essence of the Tory policy has been to impose on the Irish people everything they most hate, and to refuse and reject everything they demand. Even when remedial measures have been proposed, the Irish representatives have not been consulted, and what compromises have been made have not been yielded to argument or to the claims of the Irish representatives, but to the dissentient Liberals, and to the fear of defeat in the lobbies. The Irish leaders—with whom in 1885, with the full knowledge of all the part they had taken in the agrarian struggle of 1879–81, the Tory party had entered into close relations, with the object of defeating the then Liberal Government, and, later, of winning the elections in that year—have been treated with the utmost indignity and contempt. A base conspiracy has been promoted to destroy their characters, and to affix on them the charge of being designers and accomplices of murder and other outrages. Every effort has been made, by imprisoning them under the Crimes Act and by treating them as common criminals, to accustom the people of England to regard them as on a level with thieves and felons. Having pursued this policy, having outraged Irish opinion to the utmost, the Government cannot now turn round and offer to meet the Irish chiefs on equal terms, and to negotiate with them the terms of a Home Rule measure. Neither could the Tories abase themselves to such a point, nor could the Irish party well accept the proffered hand.

I reject, then, the suggestion that the Tory party can propound a scheme for Home Rule before the General Election. Their best game seems to me to fight out the issue again before the constituencies, to fall bravely on behalf of the bad cause they have committed themselves to. I cannot think, however, that it is the interest of the Tory party to postpone the elections for any lengthy period. They cannot be mistaken as to the general drift of opinion in the country. The recent bye-elections, the municipal elections, and many other signs point in the same direction. Not only has the principle of Home Rule made great progress, not only does it no longer frighten large bodies of electors who abstained from voting in 1886, but it is now identified with Liberal progress, if not Radical reform, in all other directions.

A tide thus set going is not easily stemmed; it will acquire constantly fresh force; it will involve not only Home Rule, but the sweeping away of many cherished institutions. The longer the elections are postponed the greater the danger to the Tory party. Nothing will add more to the movement than the impression that the Tories are unduly prolonging the duration of Parliament, in the hope of outliving the great chief to whom Home Rule owes

so much, or of securing two or three more years of office before the catastrophe comes. When the long-headed men among the Tories appreciate the fact that the country is against them on the Home Rule question, they will also perceive that it is all-important the change should be effected while two great chiefs are still able to command the assent of their followers, Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Parnell. They are both conservative influences of the highest order, in the true sense of the term. Their influence in the settlement of the question will be of the highest importance, if a lasting arrangement is to be effected. The lives of both are precarious; but it is to the last degree absurd to suppose that the absence of either or both would prevent or retard the realization of Home Rule. The settlement will be more difficult without them, but not the less it will be effected, though probably by men with less knowledge and influence, and therefore under less favourable auspices.

Surely, then, it is the interest of the Tory party that the issue should be taken soon. They might play their cards to the best advantage for an early issue before the country. They might propose, in general terms, their alternative policy to Home Rule—a scheme of Land Purchase to do away with dual ownership; the extension of Local Government to Ireland on the same principle as in England; the expenditure of public money on works in Ireland; the dealing with congested districts—without embarrassing themselves by producing the details of such Bills, which would be attended with the utmost difficulty, until the Home Rule question is out of the way. The Tory party, with such a general programme, and with the aid of a hostile report from their well-selected Commission of Judges on the action of the Irish leaders, would go to the country with the best advantage they can possibly expect. They would have their alternative programme in hand; they would be able to use the personal argument, “Are you going to hand over Ireland to these men?” they would claim that the improvement in Ireland (really due to other causes) was the result of the administration of the Crimes Act.

If beaten in the contest, their future policy would be determined largely by the extent of their defeat. If the majority against them should be great, they could accept the defeat and make the best terms. If the majority were small, they might still hope to maintain their alternative policy against another specific scheme of Home Rule produced by Mr. Gladstone, using the House of Lords to force another appeal to the country; or, better and wiser still, they could then fall back on a Round Table, and suggest their willingness to meet the leaders of all parties in friendly concert, to carry out the details of a Home Rule scheme with general assent, and therefore with every prospect of being a lasting settlement.

There is a precedent for this in what led to the constitution of

the Dominion of Canada in 1865. For long years the union in one Legislature of Upper and Lower Canada, provinces with so many distinctive institutions, and of different race and religion, had been the cause of irreconcilable difficulties and discontent, resulting in a succession of weak Governments, powerless to do good. A deadlock was at last arrived at, so serious that the leading statesmen of both provinces and all parties agreed to unite in devising a remedy. To find an issue from the deadlock they determined (to use the words of Sir John Macdonald), "on a severance to a certain extent of the union between the two provinces, and the substitution of a federal union between them and the colonies of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia." The scheme was elaborated by a small committee of opposing statesmen, and was accepted by all parties. It need not be pointed out how important for its success, and for the future of the Dominion, was this common assent at the birth of the Constitution.

It may be, it probably will be, that the new relations of Ireland to Great Britain, and of the component parts of Great Britain, will be determined in some conclave of this kind, but I doubt whether this will be possible and advisable until the country has given its decision upon the principle involved. It seems to me that it is the interest of all parties that this decision should be invited at an early date.

J. G. SHAW-LEFEVRE

I am asked to write my "view of the present situation as regards Home Rule, and what there is now between the Liberal party and original Liberal Unionists to divide them."

Well, one thing is much clearer now than it was in the summer of 1886, and it is that "original Liberal Unionists" were actuated by very various motives! It is clear now that some were at the end of their Liberalism altogether, and had lost all confidence in, and personal attachment to, Mr. Gladstone: they were ripe for desertion on any pretext, and, indeed, a goodly number of them voted Tory on the first division of the new Parliament—that on the three acres and a cow—before the introduction of any Home Rule Bill.

But these were not numerous enough to have wrecked that goodly ship the Parliament of 1885. The historian will tell that the second reading of the Home Rule Bill might easily have been carried had the Liberal leaders been willing to have said plainly and straightforwardly *that the Irish members should remain for all purposes; had they been able to have made up their minds that the united Parliament should remain "untouched in its constitution, unquestioned in its supremacy."* Instead of this distinct avowal, there was talk of some middle course, of Irish members recalled for certain purposes and for certain occasions. •

I might quote from fifty speeches to prove my contention that the crux of the whole question was the retention of the Irish members. Take one as a sample. Mr. Finlay (Hansard, May 21, 1886): "If this demand (the retention of the Irish members) were conceded, the whole Bill would be revolutionized There must, by logical sequence, emerge a measure to which *neither the noble Lord the Member for Rossendale, nor any other member on that side of the House could have any objection.*" A perfectly true statement of the quarrel as it stood on May 21, and of what *then* would have healed it. The demand was not acceded to; the concession which would have easily saved the Bill, was not made; and I for one am no repentant sinner as regards my vote on the second reading, and should do exactly the same to-morrow. The three considerations which have brought back nine-tenths of the rank and file in the constituencies to the party, have been (in my opinion):—

1. The wanton, barefaced breach of faith perpetrated by the Unionist party, and especially by the Liberal Unionists. We all fought our battle by pointing out the flaws in the defeated Bills—by protesting earnestly, and in some cases passionately, against any return to coercion—against coercion as any alternative policy at all; and by declaring that there was a safe and wise *middle* path, which would give Ireland a large and generous self-government, while retaining the United Parliament supreme in all things over the whole United Kingdom. This is the policy which the country responded to, and demands still; and this is the policy which the Unionist leaders, after having used it to win the election by, to their eternal dishonour and disgrace, put on one side *directly the victory was won*. Some five or six of us declined to join in a Tory party alliance and a coercion policy directly opposed to our election pledges; but I believe large numbers in the constituencies were startled and shocked at the breach of faith. .

The second consideration has been the way in which the Coercion Bill has been administered. Wantonly brutal, cowardly, irritating, insulting, it has aroused a very deep-grounded feeling of anger and disgust, which shows itself at the bye-elections. Indeed, it is difficult to conceive how any true Liberal, who remains a believer in the methods and ways of Liberty, can ever give a vote for one who has supported the Tory administration of Ireland during the past three years!

The third consideration has been the belief that the danger is past; that the principle of giving Ireland a safe self-government alone lives; that all that was condemned by the nation in 1886 as dangerous in the defeated Bills is dead and buried.

The bye-elections have all been won by the Liberal candidates giving plain pledges as to the retention of the Irish members and the retention intact of the United Parliament. I am not aware of a

single Liberal who has stood on the old Bill. I need not quote the numerous pledges of the leaders, more or less distinct, I admit. I believe the country is as strongly opposed as ever to any legislation which shall weaken, or *appear to threaten or call in question*, the absolute and unquestioned supremacy of the United Parliament. I believe the Liberal party is reunited more and more in the constituencies, because it has full confidence that in the coming Home Rule Bill the statutory body to be created shall be (in Mr. Gladstone's words at Nottingham) "*subject in all things to the Imperial Parliament, and liable, if need be, to be corrected by it*"; that one system of Imperial taxes shall continue to be paid alike by every Englishman, Scotchman, and Irishman (as in the United States); and that we shall hear no more of "necks of bottles," or of fixed contributions or tributes; that the Supreme Courts of Law shall be the same, open alike to every citizen of the United Kingdom, and that thus the Imperial law shall be the highest law for all. The demand for any full development of plans comes from a source which does not entitle it to respect, and can be left to the judgment of our leaders; but I confess I should like an early opportunity taken of putting beyond all doubt and question the resolution *that the United Parliament shall continue untouched in its constitution—unquestioned in its absolute and effective supremacy.*

All else is mere detail; but a very large proportion of Liberals consider this to be the one vital principle of any Home Rule proposals, and while I am personally convinced it is accepted by both leaders and rank and file generally, yet the suspicion that it is considered by some to be still an open question, or one on which compromise may be hereafter attempted, is a source of weakness, and an occasion to the enemy to blaspheme.

ARTHUR B. WINTERBOTHAM.

Is there no principle in politics? Is the government of our country to be conducted on the lines of a barren contest between the ins and the outs?

How stands the case? I put aside the Liberal Unionists. Since the main point upon which they differed—to wit, the retention of the Irish members—has been conceded, they have degenerated into a faction, and a dwindling faction, and as for their acrid and railing speeches, I would say to them, with Beatrice, "I wonder that you will still be talking; nobody marks you!"

But the Tories have always made, and still make, it an article of their faith that the Irish are an inferior race, without the capacity for self-government. They thus reason to themselves: "The Irish members are a band of low-bred hirelings, fit exemplars of the race from which they spring. Deprive Ireland then of liberty! Would

not liberty degenerate into licence among the Hottentots? What can be done with a people who are so theatrical as to insist on doggedly dying on the roadside when evicted? Why call us cruel and oppressive? People must take the consequences of their acts. Accidents will happen. Reflect that the Southern slave-owners, who were then the only 'gentlemen' in America, never objected to a slave *'dying under moderate correction.'*"

"Are the Irish leaving the country in consequence of our policy? All the better, there will be fewer of them. If population is wanted—a doubtful question—we can supply their places with Scotch and English. We feel poignant regret about the Pigott forgeries—not, of course, that such false accusations were made, but that they were discovered to be false. Still, the whole truth is not known. Who can believe Pigott's confessions? Perhaps Mr. Labouchere bribed him to flee the country and to blow out his brains to prevent his having to confess that his confessions were false. Who knows? Some people say that this attitude of ours towards the Irish savours of insolence. You cannot be insolent to an inferior, and even if that were possible, it is difficult to prevent it when an inferior is insolent to you. It is a question of taste. Thank Heaven we have Mr. Balfour, who, with a humour that robs his so-called insolence of all vulgarity, can put what we are thinking and wishing so well into words and deeds."

Such is the political *pabulum* of Tory drawing-rooms. These are the principles which guide the Tory policy.

Surely it is an impertinence to suggest that the great Tory party are insincere in their opinions. Surely it is an insult to those who thus think and reason, to ask them to join hands with us in granting to Ireland such a form of government as would satisfy Irish aspirations. Why discuss the probable effect on the Tory party of their turning their backs upon their principles when no healing or lasting measure could be the result of so unnatural a coalition. For, in the words of Burke, "no men act with effect who do not act in concert; no men can act in concert who do not act with confidence; no men can act with confidence who are not bound together by common opinions, common affections, and common interests."

BERNARD COLERIDGE.

There is a great deal of truth in what Mr. Reid says: but "in vain is the net spread in the sight of any bird." Besides, the game of the Tories and the Dissident Liberals is all arranged. The policy of dishing the Whigs is to be followed by the policy of dishing the Parnellites and the Radicals; not by giving Home Rule, but by staving it off for seven years, in the hope of stifling it altogether. This is quite possible. Before the next election a bold Local Government Bill for Ireland will be brought in. It will be opposed

by the Irishmen as not good enough; by the Radicals, because it would effectually fling them, for the moment, off the rails; and by many orthodox Liberals, because it took the wind out of their sails. But it would pass in spite of them all, and, *sub rosa*, some Liberals would welcome the half-loaf as promising a blessed relief from the incessant screaming of a hungry child. In answer to the Irishmen, the Government will say: "Take the Bill, or leave it. Our theory about you is that you are kicking up a row, and can be silenced. Anyhow, we shall pass the Bill; and if you won't work it, other people in Ireland will." In answer to the Radicals, they will say: "You are between the devil and the deep sea; and we choose the sea for you, by scuttling your ship." To the official Liberals they will say: "How can you refuse to let us do for Ireland precisely what you and we together have just done for England and Scotland?" Then, with its united supporters at its back, it will pass the Bill with a large majority. The Lords, also glad to be rid of a burning question, which is beginning to set fire to the House, and anxious to give the Party a new lease of life, will at once pass it. Then the majority of Englishmen—always disinclined to go back upon a decision, and to repudiate a bargain—will say: "As the Bill is passed, it ought to be tried." Even some good Home Rulers will say: "Anyhow, it is a great step onward. Let Irishmen use it to make their ground sure, and their power strong." And so the question of Home Rule will be shelved.

It is not a bad scheme, and it may succeed. But there are risks. In the first place, there is about the scheme *now* the ugly look of a desire to rush through without appealing to the country. If an appeal to the country could be secured, on the question of Local Government for Ireland or Home Rule, the result might be, and probably would be, the choosing of the heroic course, on the principle of doing a thing well while we are about it. But once done, some of the very people who might vote for Home Rule, if they had the choice, might vote for not upsetting an arrangement just made. This the Government know, and it is their main hope.

What hope is there, then, for the other side? Not much. If we had to deal with a Government that was as moral as Mr. W. H. Smith seems to be, I should have a great deal of hope. I should, for instance, take it for granted that it would be honest enough to give the country a chance of choosing between two rival schemes. But it is not invulnerable. Within the next twelve months it may be so plain that England is now ready to go with Scotland, Wales, and Ireland, in the matter of Home Rule for Ireland, that even Lord Salisbury would hesitate about flying in the face of the country, by passing some scheme, in a contrary sense, by a dying Parliament, and with the possibility of that scheme being smashed at the General Election. Lord Salisbury knows perfectly well that

it would be far less disastrous every way to go frankly to the country with the alternative plans, and to be beaten, than to attempt to shirk that appeal to the country, to rush through his own scheme, and *then* to be beaten, with the possibility of having his brand-new legislation ignominiously knocked on the head.

Besides, even if a Local Government scheme were passed, and were not swept away, what more likely than that every provision of it would be used for strengthening the Home Rule aspiration and agitation in Ireland? Is it worth while forcing a Local Government Bill through the House with such a prospect? What would anybody gain?

After all, then, the grand scheme for dishing Home Rulers may end in a fizzle, and an appeal may have to be made to the country on the main question: Is it to be their scheme or ours? That is our main hope; and I see no harm in showing our hand to that extent.

There is one other hope. A great land purchase scheme is inevitable. It is just possible that an attempt to make the British taxpayer responsible for a transaction not unlike that which they scouted when Mr. Gladstone proposed it, may break up the union of the "Unionists." There must be shame somewhere. But perhaps the great land scheme may be postponed. Then the main trouble will be postponed; with this difference, that Local Government in Ireland without the settlement of the land question will re-open the Home Rule fight with added vigour. So that it is Lord Salisbury who is "between the devil and the deep sea."

"As to "separate treatment for Ulster," it has never seemed to me that Englishmen who advocated it believed in it: and it really is comical to see "Unionists" becoming such blazing "separatists" as to demand the separation of Ulster from Ireland! It is sheer nonsense; and never was really anything but a kind of Protestant stick, useful for flinging at the Home Rule dog. When Home Rule is established in Ireland, the rest of Ireland will need Ulster, and Ulster will need the rest of Ireland: and that will happen which has happened here—people who howl at one another and worry one another, will learn to tolerate one another and to transact national business with one another, when they are put into one council chamber, charged with the great tasks and responsibilities that come with the supreme duty of caring together for the nation's life.

JOHN PAGE HOPPS.

I note the idea is to do something to shake the Tories from the Liberal Unionists.

If the Liberal Unionists out of Parliament are meant, then I say the Conservatives are, perforce, already shaken from them, as I con-

sider that they have practically ceased to exist as a voting power in the country.

If the Liberal Unionists in Parliament are meant, then I think all efforts will be fruitless, as they will vote with the Tories to the very death in order to postpone a dissolution.

J. SEYMOUR KEAY.

I am for Home Rule in Ireland. As it has been in the Colonies, so in Ireland Home Rule will preserve a true union with England.

In local matters Ireland will be governed according to Irish ideas. In imperial affairs we shall retain the supreme control in the executive, responsible to the Imperial Parliament.

Home Rule will give us the hearts of the Irish people, not only in Ireland, but throughout the world. This will greatly strengthen the empire.

BRASSEY.

IN DONEGAL": A REJOINDER.

THE "Reply" to the paper entitled "In Donegal," which appeared in the July number of the WESTMINSTER REVIEW, calls in its turn also for a reply.

Passing by the writer's disappointment at not finding in the July article "interesting and valuable information respecting the entire county"—political, geographical, mineralogical, and what not else—we come to his description of Mr. Olphert as "an old and popular gentleman," and to his commendable indignation against what he considers to be "a personal attack," "a cruel blow dealt below the belt."

Let me say at once that no personal attack was intended. That I lighted upon one particular corner of Donegal, and, in that corner, upon one particular estate, was a mere accident. Having been there I wrote of what I had heard and seen. What lay outside that did not concern me; what lay within should, I thought, be revealed. If I had been elsewhere in Ireland I should have written of the kind of landlord to be found elsewhere. Mr. Olphert is, moreover, a public character, a representative of Irish landlordism; and people write and speak as freely of him now, though not so often, as of Mr. Balfour and Mr. Chamberlain.

To the popularity of the landlord among his tenants I would willingly bear testimony if I could, but I cannot recall one instance which would prove the point in the "Reply." The "deputation of Leeds Radicals," cited in the "Reply" as being on the landlord's side on this popularity-question, writes, I find, as follows:—

"We found there was very little in dispute between the tenants and himself (Mr. Olphert) as to the *facts*;" and again, "The tenants expressed themselves in most respectful terms towards their landlord."

Pleasing, however, as all this is, it is not quite the same as saying that "Mr. Olphert has gained a place in the hearts and affections of his tenants." The Leeds deputation is said to have "gracefully and freely acknowledged the fact." When and where was this acknowledgment made? It is not to be found in the published report of the Leeds deputation.

The four "examples" which make against the popularity-idea

are demolished with ruthless hand by my critic. Of the four the case of Mrs. Coyle chiefly raises his ire. He is disposed to quote her history "as a fair instance of almost unexampled and even culpable landlord indulgence and forbearance." After this it will be necessary to tell the story over again, and at greater length than before.

Kate was the daughter of a coastguardsman stationed at Falcarragh, one of a large family of girls; and she married James Coyle after her father's death. The young couple had a room given them in the house of the elder Coyle, and, at the same time, half of the paternal farm, three cows' grass, as their portion of land.

After a time the one room in the old homestead became too strait for them, and James Coyle took the first chance that offered itself of buying a bit of land with a house upon it. He bought the holding of a man named McAuley (I give the names throughout so that the story may be more easily verified); and his mother-in-law, the coastguard's widow, helped him with a gift of £15, part of her savings out of a sort of pension allowed her for her three youngest children.

James and Kate Coyle had a large family, and always found it "very hard to live." At last they got into arrears, not for the three cows' grass, but for the second farm alone; and an ejectment notice was served upon them. Mrs. Coyle maintains that the promise was then made, through the agent Sweeney, that they should be let alone if only the costs were paid. There was but one cow on the farm at that time; it was sold, and the required £5 was paid. Then they were turned out (yes, "amid the usual conditions of frosty weather and little children") by Sweeney, assisted by the bailiff. Their things were thrown out in the way which has become sadly familiar to us of late; and the doorway was built up by one Richard Beattie, a local mason. Mrs. Coyle remembers that her husband took Beattie's conduct to heart, and that he used to blame him for having helped to put him out. After the eviction James Coyle was allowed to sell his interest in the farm. The purchaser was Daniel Ferry, who had just brought some money from America, and wanted to settle down in the old country. Out of the purchase-money Coyle had first to pay all arrears due to his landlord. This was at that time the usual way of securing arrears. The evicted person was allowed to sell in order that he might have wherewith to pay all arrears due to the landlord. There would generally be some trifle over and above with which he could start life afresh. In some cases the landlord himself sold the tenant-right to the next tenant, and then he pocketed all. This was pleasanter for the landlord, but it had an ugly look to other people.

The Coyle family, then, being evicted, retired to the three cows'

grass, which was still their own. There was no room in the home-
stead for them, so they went into the one-windowed barn described
in the July number of this REVIEW. James Coyle was "processaed"
several times for the three cows' grass during the five or six years
which remained to him of life. Since his death Kate Coyle has
twice paid costs, and, according to the writer of the "Reply," has
twice fallen into arrears. "How many English landlords," he asks,
"would allow their tenants to fall into similar arrears?" This is
hardly a fair question. When Irish tenants are placed on the same
footing as English tenants my critic may ask it again.

The plenitude of "horses and stock," when inquiry is made, comes
down to one "horse-beast" and two cows. Kate Coyle never had
more than two cows at a time, and often had not even one. The
"horse-beast" was a "clib" (filly), bought by James Coyle soon
after his marriage. It died about ten years ago, leaving a "wee
clib," and this is the only "horse-beast" Mrs. Coyle has since had
in her possession. It died last April before she was evicted. The
nucleus of the little flock owned by her daughter was not bought with
money made out of the holding, but with what the girl had earned
by field-labour, partly on Mr. Olphert's own farm. The sheep and
lambs grazed on the common of the townland "down by the sea."

It is an insult to Kate Coyle to say that she was "wanting in
thrift." "Her family broke up and scattered away from her"—
why? Simply to make money to pay the rent which the holding
would not yield. Thousands of families have had to break up in
like manner; and there is a ceaseless flow of Australian and
American money, which has, until lately, found its way into the
pockets of the landlords.

The friend quoted by the writer of the "Reply" appears to have
given us but a half-truth. "Kate Coyle has to my knowledge," he
asserts, "remained in undisturbed possession of her holding in Drum-
natinny for the last twenty-eight years." For the last twenty-eight
years maybe, and perhaps even for more, Kate Coyle has had posses-
sion of her three cows' grass situated in Drumnatinny. No one ever
said that she was evicted from that holding. She never was evicted
from it, in fact, until the end of last April. It has been in her pos-
session ever since her wedding-day. The insinuation is that as she
has had "undisturbed possession" of that particular holding she has
never been evicted from any other holding. But the eviction from
the second farm is, I am told, "matter of notoriety in the district,
and cannot be questioned or doubted in the least." The solemn words
which are to be found on the first page of the "Reply" come in here
with singular appropriateness: "It is, indeed, one of the most painful
and unfortunate conditions of the present controversy raging round
the Irish question that, with a certain class of politicians, assertion
has assumed the place of argument, and suppression or contortion of

important facts is resorted to as a legitimate weapon of political warfare. In a word, truth is too often uncrowned, and her rival allowed to reign supreme."

"The example of James McGinley" is commented on in the "Reply" in the following manner:—

"The Reviewer's story when boiled down amounts to this. That McGinley having purchased a farm subject to a non-judicial rent of £15 7s., found, when too late, that a judicial agreement for £15 was existing between the landlord and the old tenant (Wilkinson). The writer does not mention that before McGinley appeared on the scene the farm had been actually sold to a man named Greer, and the purchase money paid over. It was then made so clear to Greer that he was not a *persona grata* to his neighbours, and that another man desired the place, that he entreated Mr. Olphert to cry off and return his money, which was accordingly done. In the meantime, McGinley approached Wilkinson, and offered a larger sum (£150) for the farm than Greer was able to pay, and said he would give £200 if Wilkinson would have the rent judicially fixed at £12 per annum. Wilkinson states that he then told McGinley that 'the farm was so cheap that no one would venture into Court for fear of having the rent increased.' In some part of Ireland McGinley's conduct would be termed 'land-grabbing,' and in no view of the case does he merit any sympathy. His offer to Wilkinson shows that he bought with his eyes open, and, even according to his own showing, he became aware of the existence of a judicial rent before the purchase was completed, and could then and there have recovered the money paid had he so desired."

This is the case for the Landlord. Before entering into the case for the Tenant, I should like to ask, What has the story of Greer to do with the transaction by which McGinley was cheated? Greer was not once mentioned during cross-examination either by Wilkinson or by Mr. Conybeare. And how can McGinley's conduct be termed "land-grabbing" if Greer had already cried off, and had had his money returned? And so far from Greer's being not "a *persona grata* to his neighbours," he was, says an old inhabitant of Falcarragh, "a very popular man in the place." "I never heard anything to the contrary," adds my informant. Moreover, "Greer never had the farm which James McGinley bought from Wilkinson. It was while the farm was vacant that Mr. Olphert was about selling it to Greer; but when Wilkinson learned the landlord's intention, he sold it to James McGinley, and paid the arrears of rent."

Having thus disposed of Greer, let us recapitulate, with fuller detail, the story of James McGinley. In the "Reply" my former sketch is characterized as "a flagrant instance of *suppressio veri*." My readers shall judge for themselves.

At the time when Wilkinson and his brother were getting into

difficulties, James McGinley was looking about for more land to add to his holding. He had four sons, and one or two of them were living at home and could help him with the land. Wilkinson was clerk of the petty sessions, and his salary, with fees, would be about £100 a year. Nevertheless his arrears of rent amounted to £100, and he was evicted. He managed to redeem within the statutory six months, and hastened to get rid of his holding. McGinley bought the tenant-right from him for £150, £100 of which was sent by a son from Australia, £25 was contributed by the other sons, who were at work on the county roads, and £25 was borrowed. Mr. Olphert directed McGinley to pay the money to Wilkinson; and the receipt given him is dated February 11, 1884. The rent was £15 7s., a rent which McGinley thought too high, and which he fully intended to take into the Land Courts for reduction. It is quite possible that Wilkinson made the remark quoted by the writer of the "Reply," that "the farm was so cheap that no one would venture into court for fear of having the rent increased." There is nothing which makes against McGinley in this. Is Wilkinson the first seller who has tried to convey the impression that what he sells is not only good, but cheap?

McGinley expected to have about 6s. 8d. in the pound taken off by the Land Commission. He would, however, first see the landlord's agent, and try to make some arrangement which would save him from going into Court. He waited for this until November came round with its rent-day, and then he went, rent in hand, to see what could be done. By this time, he it remembered, he had paid all but £30 of the purchase-money, and had given bonds for the rest. To his utter amazement he found that Wilkinson and the landlord had by agreement fixed a "fair rent" for the holding out of Court, and had had it stated by the Land Commission, which made it binding for the judicial term of fifteen years. When inquiry was made at the office in Dublin, the agreement was found to be dated March 14, 1884.

Mr. Olphert had consented to McGinley's buying the holding; he had directed him to pay the money to Wilkinson; and then, when the place had been nearly a month in the new tenant's hands, a judicial rent had been secretly fixed, a rent which had been reduced by the merely nominal sum of seven shillings. I must remind the writer of the "Reply" that this is not matter of hearsay, but is taken from Wilkinson's sworn evidence in the Crimes Court of Falcarragh. Mr. Leamy, M.P., barrister-at-law, and Mr. Toland, solicitor, consider that a serious action lies against Mr. Olphert and Mr. Wilkinson for conspiracy to defraud. Wilkinson is "a man of superior intelligence and high character, thoroughly incapable of doing a shabby action or taking a mean advantage of another." Be it so. I have no desire to dispute fact.

James McGinley had practically no remedy, for the expense of moving in one of the superior Courts was quite beyond his means. He had spent nearly £80 in improving the land and repairing the dwelling-house upon it. His sons, the road-contractors, helped him with money for rent and improvements. Times were bad and the struggle was hard. At last he asked the landlord to relieve him of the holding. He would give it up for £120 rather than continue such a losing game. Mr. Olphert would not agree to this. Then McGinley made another proposal. He begged the landlord and his agent to fix what they would consider a fair rent for a man in his circumstances, especially with regard to the depressed state of agriculture at that time. Again Mr. Olphert refused. What becomes then of the assertion that McGinley could have "recovered the money paid had he so desired"?

After this McGinley's sons declined to help their father any longer to "give in to the landlord," and the farm began to fall into arrears. Ejectment proceedings were instituted, but fell through on some technical point of law, and the tenant had to be reached in some other way. A writ was obtained in Dublin, under which the farm was sold by the sheriff over McGinley's head. The landlord was then able to buy it, and did buy it, for the sum of £1. Still McGinley held on. About £230 earned by himself and his sons was sunk in the place, and he would not leave until he was turned out. He joined the Plan of Campaign in sheer desperation, seeing neither hope nor help anywhere else.

After the eviction on May 27 McGinley, his son, and another man who had helped him in resistance, were committed for eight days to Derry Gaol. They were brought to the Crimes Court at Falcarragh on June 4, but the trial was postponed until the 18th on account of the illness of one of the witnesses. McGinley had a cross case against Houston, the emergency man, for assault after surrender of the garrison, and this also was postponed. Mr. McFadden, solicitor, then called attention to the fact that the three men had been committed for eight days only. Further detention was illegal. The retort of the magistrates, Messrs. Harvey and Bourke, was that "it made no difference to them whether the prisoners were there legally or not; that, as they were there, the Court would deal with them; and that Mr. McFadden might seek his remedy elsewhere." And, when Mr. McFadden advised his clients to leave the Court, the police were at once ordered to prevent their departure. James McGinley, however, did not go back to gaol at that time, for his wife was dangerously ill, and he consented to give bail.

On the 18th Messrs. Harvey and Bourke were in their places. Mr. Toland, solicitor, contended that this was not an ordinary case of a tenant's obstructing a sheriff, and he told at length the story of

the secret agreement, and of McGinley's wrongs. The magistrates "did not see in what way any grievance McGinley might have could affect the case before the Court"; and sentenced the three men to four months' imprisonment with hard labour.

McGinley's case against Houston came to nothing. "We give up!" he had said the moment the enemy had broken in. Houston's assault was made after this, and it was so savage that the doctor who dressed McGinley's head described the wound as "contused" and "lacerated," "two inches long, and penetrating to the skull." He "could not say," moreover, "that the man's life was not in danger for some days after he dressed his wound, which was of such a nature that the most serious consequences and complications might be apprehended." All things are easy to a Removable Magistrate. It was announced from the bench that "informations against Houston" were refused. "It would be all the same even if Houston had killed McGinley. He was acting in the discharge of his duty." Comment is needless.

With regard to Doohan, another of my "examples," it may be observed that the agent's clerk when on oath gave no such explanation as is now offered in the "Reply." He gave, in fact, no explanation at all. Against the assertion in the "Reply" we have the facts that Hewson acknowledged that "it looked like it," and at the same time refused to consult the better map in his office. To say that Doohan has not sought legal redress since his eviction is worthy of Mr. Balfour himself. It is not likely that he has money to spend on a lawsuit, nor is it likely, judging from past experience, that he will get justice from an Irish magistrate.

One would like to ask concerning Smullen, from whom a money-receipt was withheld: Has he had any receipt yet? And, if so, when was it given him? The agent forgot! It is, or was, a common thing in Donegal to refuse to give any acknowledgment of money paid in by the tenants, unless the full amount were paid. Smullen owed the rent of three years and paid the rent of one. If no receipt has been given him the ejectment notice still hangs over his head. Payment of rent must be proved before an ejectment notice can be withdrawn. Would the Court be satisfied in the absence of a receipt?

With regard to an "example" of a different character, the statement in the "Reply" that Mr. Olphert did not *evict* a set of tenants a generation ago is perfectly correct. I am sorry that my words were so carelessly chosen as to bear that meaning. The people were crushed into mere remnants of their original holdings by the appropriation of large tracts of their mountain-grazing. They contended that they had had "the mountain" as common land "from time immemorial." Other landlords beside Mr. Olphert did the same kind of thing, and appear to have done even more than he did.

Mr. A. M. Sullivan tells the story in *New Ireland* in the following way :—

"Some two or three of the proprietors had conceived the idea—or, more probably, had been weakly persuaded by Scotch farm stewards—that fortunes might be made out of those wild mountains, now used solely by cottiers for grazing a few goats, heifers, and sheep. By taking up the mountains wholly or in part from the people, and extensively stocking them with imported black-faced sheep, these landlords were led to believe that thousands a year might be cleared in profit. The attempt to deprive the people of the mountains led to deplorable conflict, suffering, and loss. The benevolent pretext of 'squaring the farms'—sometimes, no doubt, a generous and well-meant motive, but occasionally an excuse for dexterously cheating the people—did not avail. While the cottiers and the landlords were fighting over the question, lo! the Scotch shepherds announced that the black-faced sheep were disappearing from the hills—stolen by the hostile inhabitants it was, of course, assumed. Search of the tenants' houses failed to verify this conclusion. Some few traces of such thefts were found here and there, but not in any extent to account for the disappearance of so many hundred sheep. Soon what had happened became more clear. Dead bodies of sheep were found in scores all over the hills—killed by the lawless natives it was now concluded. Presentments for the value of the sheep thus assumed to have been 'maliciously destroyed' were levied on the districts. Still the destruction, or rather the mysterious disappearance, of the sheep went on. The more it did the more heavy the penalty was made; and the more sweeping the presentments the more extensive grew the destruction! At last it occurred to one of the Crown officials that there was something suspicious in all this. He noted that, whereas sheep imported from Scotland cost from seven-and-sixpence to ten shillings a head, on the mountain they were presented for at seventeen-and-sixpence to twenty-five shillings. It occurred to him that while this went on sheep-losing would flourish. Suspicion once aroused, strange facts came to light. The houses of the shepherds themselves were searched, and mutton in rather too generous abundance was found. Then a serious investigation was prosecuted, when it was incontrovertibly established that the sheep had perished in large numbers from the stress of weather, still more extensively from falling over crags and precipices, and to some comparatively small extent by the surreptitious supply of the shepherds' tables. Shortly came the remarkable fact of the going judges of assize indignantly refusing to fiat these monstrous claims, and denouncing the whole proceeding. (After the verdict of the jury at Lifford Assizes had declared the sheep to have perished as I have described, the judge, Chief Justice Monahan, said, 'I am as satisfied as I am of my very existence that

those sheep were not maliciously killed.') *Mirabile dictu*, when the presentments were stopped the *black-faced sheep importation fell through*. But in the interval what suffering had been visited on the wretched people. The 'levies' had reduced them, poor as they were at best, to a plight which might have excited the compassion of a Kurd murderer."

If the landlords had waited till the days of the Land Acts they could not have appropriated as they did the grazing land, which was as much a part of the people's holdings as the small scraps that were actually left them. "Nothing was done until 1870," says Sir Charles Russell, speaking generally of Ireland, "to protect the tenants, or stay the rapacity of the landlords." It must be acknowledged that English and Scotch landlords have shown themselves capable of encroaching on the public land, but to them also is coming a day when what is not their own must be given up.

"The law locks up the man or woman
Who steals the goose from off the common ;
But leaves the greater villain loose
Who steals the common from the goose."

As far as I can ascertain Mr. Olphert (whatever the other landlords of the district may have done) did not himself stock the mountains with sheep. I was in this misled by the common talk of the country, and by what I had read on the subject. What Mr. Olphert appears to have done was to let the mountain pastures of which he had dispossessed his tenants to Scotch sheep-farmers. There is not a very great difference between letting the land for sheep-farming and holding the sheep-farm for oneself; but the mistake must be, and is, freely acknowledged.

The "wretched spectacle of desolation" seen by Mr. A. M. Sullivan was brought about in the first place by the seizure of the common grazing lands. Many of the peasants complained that they had to sell their stock because they had no place for them to graze in. Then there was a rise of rent throughout the district. Next came the sheep-tax and then the police-tax. The latter was levied for the support of the police who were sent to collect the sheep-tax. Close upon this followed something like a famine: a committee was formed to relieve the distress; an appeal was published in the newspapers; and at last a Parliamentary Commission sat upon "the alleged destitution in Gweedore and Cloughaneely." One of the men who signed the appeal, who was most active in the cause of the tenants, and who gave evidence against the landlords before the Parliamentary Commission, was the Rev. James McFadden, C.C. He is now the parish priest of Cloughaneely, and in the "Reply" it is stated that he "has lived there respected and beloved for the last forty years." But not more than thirty years ago he was a

thorn in the side of Mr. Olphert. The language of the landlord's heart, indeed, appears to have been: "Is there no one who will rid me of this turbulent priest?" The appeal which Father McFadden helped to draw up is described by Mr. Olphert before the Commission as "one of the greatest impositions that ever was practised upon the public." Asked whether a great many people referred settlements of disputes to himself, he answered "A great many." "Do you know that a great many cases are referred to the clergyman?" was the next question. "A great deal too many," he said. "If they would interfere less with the settlement of the land we should not have this disputing." And again, "I do not know what their object is, except to try to make bad feeling exist between landlord and tenant. I have known them interfere very frequently when I have given additional pieces of land to the tenants, and they would not allow them to take them." "To whom do you refer?" asked a Commissioner, anxious to come to particulars. "To the Rev. Mr. McFadden," was the prompt reply. "If it were not for Mr. Doherty and Mr. McFadden," he said, in answer to another question, "we should have had no trouble of any kind, or any talking about the mountains." So, after all, in spite of all one hears to day, there was disturbance upon the Olphert estates before the Plan of Campaign!

And now, what, after all, is the land like which in the "Reply" is praised as "excellent"? There is no need for me to repeat what I said in July, or make fresh "assertions" on the subject, for there are many confirmatory statements to hand; but I should like to say that I spoke only of what I had seen myself, and that to my English eyes all the land looked bad. The worst of bog and rock land and the most miserable of sheep were seen about Glasserchoo and Derrybeg. This was plainly stated on p. 98 of the WESTMINSTER REVIEW.

The Report of the Parliamentary Commission in 1858 calls the districts of Gweedore and Cloughaneely "a wild and mountainous country." Mr. Maguire, who sat on the Commission, wrote afterwards of the "wild and bleak mountainous region, the soil of which generally is of the very poorest quality, producing but scanty crops of oats and potatoes." The appeal which led to the Commission describes the district as the "bleakest and most mountainous in Ireland. The entire surface is broken up by huge, abrupt, and irregular hills of granite, covered with a texture of stunted heath, while the space between is but a shaking and spongy marsh." Lord George Hill's evidence concerning his estate in Gweedore was that the ground was of various qualities; "generally mountainous, sometimes more boggy, sometimes less." His tenants were astonished at his attempt to turn a certain piece of forbidding-looking ground into farm-land. It cost him, he said, "a great deal of time, labour, and money. The hill part was costly because stony. I think it cost about £14 an

acre, and the boggy part cost about £7 an acre." He also declared that these figures would represent the average outlay necessary for the reclamation of the same description of land throughout the district. No wonder that the next question put to Lord George Hill ran as follows: "Now, considering that it cost you a large capital to improve the land, how can you imagine that human beings could live and improve those cuts? How could they contrive to maintain themselves? Would you be surprised that they could be anything but miserable and wretched considering that they squat down on those cuts which are let to them in a state of nature, and are compelled to make every improvement for their occupation?"

Mr. Underwood, another witness, a gentleman who had gone into Donegal to try to invest money in land for a friend, and who was heartily glad afterwards that he had not carried out his purpose, said that there was "no valuable land, or very little, in the Gweedore district. A man could not live on one of the new cuts unless sustained. It was a struggle for life, not life itself."

Mr. Sharman Crawford testified to having seen "immense quantities of marshy, moory land, a great portion of which has good soil under it and would be capable of improvement."

The Rev. J. Doherty (of whom Mr. Olphert complained) told me of the 1720 acres which were under water out of a total of 40,511 acres in Gweedore. "Within a few miles of each other," he added, "are Errigal (2462 feet), Carntrena (1396) and Bloody Foreland (1036), and there are numerous smaller hills." "Magnificent scenery," yes, and "noble hills:" the writer of the "Reply" is right; but the best farm-lands do not lie in such tracts of country.

Sir Charles Russell tells us of the "sterile bleak hillsides that any one can see in Donegal to-day"; and the special correspondent of the *Bradford Observer*, looking at the Olphert estate, and hearing that it has produced £2200 a year, wonders that it "ever raised as many shillings. Nine-tenths of it," he goes on to say, "is simple peat, or whatever the labour of successive generations has managed to convert peat into. . . . On the surface, rock where it is not heather; below, slimy mud where it is not peat." Even Ardsmore, "the garden of the Olphert property," is nothing but (to quote the *Bradford Observer*) "a succession of rocky knolls between which a few patches of tillage or of grazing land may be scraped." It needs no drainage, fortunately, but then it has to be "fenced from the sea; and several of those tenants who have been evicted spent untold labour in building the ramparts." And I have it from a local authority that Ardsmore needs great labour and heavy manuring to produce its crops.

The deputation of Leeds Radicals adds that the Olphert estate is "a very rugged, mountainous district, prolific of rocks and huge boulders. There is practically no land, as we understand it, except

what has been made or reclaimed by the tenants from the mountain-side, from rocky ground, or bog, or stony moor-land."

"Land, indeed!" exclaims a late visitor to the district (his letter is to be found in the *Manchester Guardian*). "It is pure bog—nought save slushy peat, without the shadow of a subsoil, full of blocks of granite, with layers of fine gravel at varying depths. When a man enters a new cut, his first labour is to remove the coarse bog-grass from the part he wishes to cultivate, generally about half his holding. He then has to remove all the larger stones—a simply Herculean task, as each has to be taken up separately with a crowbar. Some idea of the vastness of this work may be gained from a rough estimate which I made of the amount of stones taken off a plot of ground about five acres in extent. The man had built walls of them simply to be rid of them. I calculated that there were about two hundred and fifty yards of walls, from two to three feet thick, and on the average about four feet high. The stones were about a foot in diameter. When the large stones have been removed the ground next requires to be drained and dried, which necessitates the digging of trenches several feet in depth at intervals of a few yards. Unless the bog is by no means deep it is practically impossible to drain it, and it sometimes happens that a person on entering a new holding may find that he is wholly unable to cultivate it. Then, when the tenant has drained his land, he is left with nothing but hard, dry turf, the same as that used for fuel, the only difference being that it is full of small stones. And this is the land on which they have to attempt to raise a crop!"

The special correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian* follows in the same style:

"Mr. Olphert's estate is seven miles long by seven miles wide, and therefore there may be two or three nooks of it which are good land. But as for the greatest part of the estate—well, I will try to describe it. Most Manchester people know Chat Moss; a good many of them know that grand valley of rocks which tourists visit on their way from Chapel-en-le-Frith to the Peak Cavern. Take that valley and Chat Moss and mix them thoroughly up together, and you have the Olphert estate. No person in his senses would try to cultivate such land if he wanted to make a profit out of it. The process of rendering it fit for any kind of crop is a terrible one. After the stones have been tugged up and rolled away, and the bog drained, and the bog-plants stubbed up, the land has to be tilled and manured for five successive years before anything will grow. When some kind of *humus* has been created the cost to the tenant has been simply shocking. Taking the Donegal price of labour—a shilling a day—the preparation of the land for a crop will not have cost less than thirty pounds an acre, or considerably more than the price of good freehold land in England. Of course,

no farmer—I mean by the appellation a man who hopes to get his living out of the land—would settle on the Olphert estate, whether he was English, Scotch, Welsh, or even Irish. The loss would about double the profit if he had the land rent free. In other words, the land has no economic value whatever."

Mrs. Ernest Hart, in describing the journey from Letterkenny to Gweedore, says: "For some distance round about Letterkenny the land has been reclaimed and cultivated, but on taking the road to the coast all traces of well-being and the pleasant green fields are soon left behind, and the road for thirty miles passes through the black bog-land of the Donegal highlands. Here and there tiny settlements may be seen, distinguished by green patches by a lonely lake; but these are scarce, and generally the bogs are given up to the snipe and woodcock and to the maddening midges." Of Gweedore she says that it is "situated on a broad slope of bog-land, stretching from the seashore to the range of mountains of which marble-topped Errigal and broad Muckish are the highest summits. The settlements, or so-called farms, carved out of the bog, may be distinguished on either side of the Dunlewy Lake and Clady River, as soon as the mountains are crossed, but as we descend towards the sea they occur at more frequent intervals, until, at last, by the shore, they lie together in long narrow strips from eight to ten feet wide; or else, reduced to very small dimensions, they may be seen thickly scattered on the promontories which jut out into the sea. The tenants' houses or cabins can scarcely be distinguished from the huge boulders which cumber the ground. The whole of these farms have, without exception, been wild bog-land, reclaimed by the unremitting toil of generations of honest peasants."

Lastly, Mr. S. Laing writes to the *Daily News* of "the condition of the wilder parts [of Ireland] bordering on the Atlantic." He mentions Donegal as one of the counties where there is "the poorest land conceivable; nearly all bare rocks, boulder, or bog." The Right Hon. W. H. Smith has been contrasting the enterprise of the Orcadian people with the indolence of the Irish under "similar circumstances of outward surroundings and like disadvantages of soil and climate." Mr. Laing points out that "the soil of Orkney is generally excellent, that of the west of Ireland execrable"; that Orkney has good harbours and has "always stood on the high road of important branches of commerce and shipping," while Ireland, as every one knows, has few advantages of this kind. "And then comes in," he says in conclusion, "what, after all, is the cardinal point of difference between Orkney and the poorer parts of Ireland. The rents of good land in Orkney, with all its advantages, are actually lower for small holdings by at least 20 or 25 per cent. than those for similar holdings in Ireland. The Orkney tenants have rarely been rack-rented or have had their rents

raised on them for their own improvements. Rents, as a rule, are levied on the intrinsic or agricultural value of the land, and paid out of its surplus produce, not from extraneous sources such as remittances from sons and daughters in America. The direct reverse of all those conditions has prevailed for centuries in Ireland, and to a great extent still prevails. Even in Orkney, with all its advantages, the judicial rents fixed by the Crofters' Commission have been reduced from 25 to 30 per cent., and are lower than the judicial rents fixed for worse land in Ireland. And arrears of unjust rents are declared by law to be unjust, and have been reduced in some cases by as much as 80 per cent. in Scotland, while they are held to be just in Ireland, and tenants are daily being evicted on them." Mr. Laing concludes with the belief that Mr. Smith will not quote again "the contrast between Orkney and Ireland as one between Norse energy and Celtic apathy under precisely the same circumstances of soil, legislation, and environment."

This mention of "environment," or, to put it in full, "facility of communication with markets," brings us to one of the great difficulties in the way of the Donegal peasant. The "skilled English agriculturist" seems to have forgotten that the "portions of Mr. Olphert's estate" inspected by him were far away from "that part of England with which he was acquainted." *If* situated there—! But it is not. *If* in the midst of good transport service—! But it is not. There is great value in an "if." Fifteen or twenty-five shillings an acre would not be too much to pay in the neighbourhood of railways and good markets (always supposing that the value of the land was the result of expenditure of the landlord's capital), but where is the market and where are the railways which can be of service to the peasantry of Donegal? Mrs. Ernest Hart finds great difficulty in the way of her noble attempt to establish cottage industries in Ireland. She tells us that her "nearest centre of industry" is forty miles from Derry, and that cartage of raw material and finished goods costs her 3s. 6d. per cwt. The cost of transit between London and Gweedore is £6 a ton! A small steamer plying between Liverpool and Sligo sometimes takes bales of wool to Donegal, "but as there is no harbour into which the steamer can run (Bunbeg being impracticable), the bales have to be delivered in the open sea under the shelter of Gola Island. A few months ago" (this was written in May 1887) "I sent 1500 lbs. of wool by this steamer, but three weeks passed before it could be landed, though twice a week as the steamer went by my anxious workers went out in boats to bring in the bales, but so rough was the sea, and so dangerous is the coast, that the steamer had to stand far out to sea, and my poor people were week after week disappointed."

Two farmers of the better class at Dunfanaghy had last year some excellent barley for sale. They could not sell it nearer home than

Derry. Samples had first to be taken to the city that a sale might be effected before the expenses of carriage were risked. The barley realized 8*d.* per stone, but it had to be delivered carriage-free. Twenty-five (English) miles of road to Letterkenny, and a journey by rail from Letterkenny to Derry brought the cost of carriage up to 30*s.* a ton; nearly a quarter, that is, of the gross price. "The celebrated Ardsmore" is ten miles further than Dunfanaghy from the nearest railway station, and an extra 7*s.* 6*d.* per ton would be required for carriage of its produce.

It is not long since the Rev. Canon Olphert stated in a public letter that the Olphert property, when bought by his ancestor two centuries ago for £300, was nothing but a "howling wilderness." Two townlands alone have been added to the original purchase, and they represent only £100 or £150, perhaps, of gross rental out of the £2200 acknowledged by Mr. Olphert to be his in the year 1884. Who is it that has increased the value of the land during the last two hundred years? The landlord, as the "Reply" justly states, is "a mere rent-charger." But if it be the business of the tenants to improve the land and of the landlord simply to receive the rent, how comes it to pass that any rent is given and received which is higher than the Government valuation for "howling wilderness"?

Griffiths' valuation was made for taxation purposes and not for the fixing of rents. It sets down distinct figures for (1) reclaimed or agricultural land, (2) for buildings thereon, and (3) for rough land, which is, being interpreted, "howling wilderness." All that the people have put into the land is, or ought to be, their own. Let the landlord remain as "rent-charger" if he will, but let him not raise the rents upon the improvements made by the tenants in the manner which my critic calls "impossible."

The Blue Book of 1858 speaks again and again of acres valued at 3*d.*, 2*d.*, a 1*d.*, and even at a $\frac{1}{2}$ *d.*; and the Government valuation to-day reveals thousands of 2*d.* acres. The contention that "the rents of farms upon the Olphert estate seldom exceed the Government valuation and are often under it" is misleading. The valuation here spoken of is that of reclaimed land, often with buildings thereon. What though part of it be let for 5*s.* to 10*s.* per acre? Was this the original value of the land before it was reclaimed by the tenant? or has the landlord made or paid for any improvements which will justify him in exacting an increased rent?

Let some "new cut," a piece, that is, of the wilderness, be brought before the Land Commission to have a fair rent fixed. If the Commissioners follow their usual practice the rent should be somewhere about the Government valuation. But the Government valuation of all such land in the district is only a penny or two an acre. The present rents, therefore, are far in excess of the Government valuation. "None is rented at twopence." No; and in this lies the grievance.

The contention of the landlord class is, that rent is the first claim on whatever the tenant possesses. The more he possesses the merrier for the landlord. The principle might lead to great absurdities. The amount of rent demanded might be reckoned by the length of one's purse. A tenant may, for instance, be making money elsewhere, or he may have property entirely independent of the land that he is reclaiming. Out of this land the barest subsistence only is possible, perhaps not even that. What matter? There is the property or pension outside, or money flowing in from Australia, or the earnings of the children. The man is quite able to pay; and he must pay according to what he is possessed of and not according to what he makes out of his land.

The landlord has no right to be paid in rent for any anything but what he gives the tenant, whatever be its value as the property of the landlord. He gives him rough land valued at twopence an acre. In the course of years it may bloom as the garden of Eden. What then? Did the landlord give him that? Nay, verily; and twopence an acre is all that is due.

"The land is not badly tilled, notwithstanding all the Reviewer's assertions to the contrary." The Reviewer made no such assertions. "The land is not badly tilled." Who tills it? There are horses, carts, and ploughs, says the writer of the "Reply." Who paid for them? "Seaweed is most eagerly sought for," and is carted for miles "at a considerable cost." Why? The writer in the *Manchester Guardian*, from whom I have before quoted, says, "Farmyard manure they have only in the very smallest quantities, so their only resource is seaweed, the very worst kind of manure, which would, if employed on good land, absolutely ruin it in a few years' time."

The "ten score" sheep on the Keeldrum mountains belong to two tenants, whose rents respectively are as low as £4 2s. 6d. and £1. The suggestion is that great profit has been made by the tenants out of these moderately rented holdings. This is a sweeping assumption. The money that put the sheep on the mountains must have come from some other source outside the holdings. Perhaps it came from the Antipodes.

The Olphert property, which began as a "howling wilderness," is even now practically worthless in a commercial sense outside the native community. The following statement has been published in English and Irish newspapers by the Rev. P. Kelly, P.P., of Dunfanaghy, and has never been contradicted or disproved:—

"Two-thirds or three-fourths of all our Donegal occupiers would be much better off if they got a shilling a day for the united labour of each family, say three workers in each, than they would be on the products of their holdings without any rent."

If we were not so near the twentieth century a scheme of serfage

might be proposed. It is somewhat mediæval, but it has this advantage, that the labourers would be clothed, fed, and housed at the expense of the landlord, and he, for his own advantage, would do all three a little better than the tenants are at present able to do for themselves.

It is often said that small holdings are the bane of western Ireland. And yet five or six acres of the wretched land in that region are as much as the average family can cultivate properly. Poor land needs extra labour; extra manure, extra seed. Give a man more land and you only spread his labour over a greater area with less advantage. Paid labour is quite out of the question, for the land does not even pay family labour.

When in the "Reply" it is asked what margin is left "to the landlord out of which to support himself and his family," one cannot help feeling that a more pertinent question would be: What margin is left to the tenant for rent-paying after (1) reclamation and (2) cultivation of the land? For what right-to-support has the landlord earned to his land? And, when the great expense of living is complained of, the query naturally arises, does the landlord wish to escape all expenditure whatsoever? If he be the chief landowner in the parish he ought to be the chief support of the church. The church, moreover, is his own church, not the church of his tenants. Income-tax is paid by others besides Irish property-owners; Crown-rents and quit-rents are not unheard of elsewhere. Would Mr. Olphert be so good as to tell us what is the amount of the Crown and quit-rents which, with income-tax and tithe rent-charge, leave him with so little margin wherewith to sustain life?

It is said that the value of any improvements made by the tenant upon his farm is "fully secured" to him. That this was the intention of the Land Act is undoubted; but the law courts and the ingenuity of the landlord interest have baffled this intention. The celebrated decision in the Court of Appeal in the case of *Adams v. Dunseath* has created a precedent which other judges are not slow to follow. Long enjoyment of improvements is equivalent to compensation for them! No common, sordid compensation, therefore, is required. Labour, like virtue, is its own reward. Every tenant may, since this decision, be legally rented on the result of his own outlay and labour as in the good old times before there was a Land Act to vex the soul of the Irish landlord.

Mr. Clancy, M.P., in an article in the *Contemporary Review* of last July, points out that there are, at least, ten classes of tenants who cannot enter the Land Courts. They are, therefore, practically at the mercy of their landlords; and it is absurd to say that "the landlord with the most avaricious intentions" is powerless to raise the rents on his tenants' improvements. To be exempt from possible rack-renting, one must be able to make application to the Land Courts

for the fixing of a fair rent. The list of tenants who have no power to do this is given by Mr. Clancy as follows :—

“(a) All tenants of lands let for pasture and valued at £50 a year or over ;

“(b) All tenants of pasture-holdings, whatever the valuation, who do not reside on the holdings, though they may be practically their only means of support ;

“(c) All holders of town-parks, often in no way different from ordinary farms ;

“(d) All tenants of holdings in which may be a perch of so-called demesne lands or a landlord's residence ;

“(e) All tenants of so-called home-farms, which are practically what any landlord chooses to call such ;

“(f) All tenants whose tenancies have commenced since August 22, 1881 ;

“(g) All tenants of cottage allotments exceeding half an acre ;

“(h) All leaseholders whose leases are for a longer period than ninety-nine years ;

“(i) All leaseholders whose leases contain covenants preventing tillage or meadowing, although these covenants may never, as is often the case, be enforced except for the purpose of preventing the tenant from going into Court ;

“(j) Every tenant of part of a holding, of whatever size, which since the Act of 1881 has been divided—say, by a father between two sons.”

Mr. Clancy next shows that there are other tenants who are practically, though not nominally, shut out of the Land Courts.

“(a) Many poor tenants who cannot bear the expenses attendant on the appeal which the landlord may always take, and often does take, from the inferior Land Court to the head Land Court ;

“(b) Most tenants pressed down with arrears of rack-rents.”

• Mr. Clancy expressly says that though some tenants in arrears have gone into Court, and have had fair rents fixed, many others have been evicted for non-payment of arrears after they have applied to the Court and before they could gain the judicial rent required. And he quotes from a speech delivered in the House of Commons in March 1888 by Mr. T. W. Russell, M.P., the fact that the tenants “were threatened and bullied by the agent before they went in, and these arrears were held over their heads as a whip to prevent their going into Court and getting the fair rent that the House designed and intended for them.”

The slowness of the Land Commission's administration is another hardship to the tenant. It is stated by Mr. Clancy that at the date of the latest annual report of the Land Commission over sixty-thousand cases were still undisposed of. And to come to one particular case, up to last May (according to Mr. Balfour's own

confession), not one of eighty tenants on the Olphert estate had had his case heard, "although all had served applications to have fair rents fixed so far back as October 1887."

It all comes back again to this, the root of all the evil: The tenants in properties like Mr. Olphert's have made the land, and the landlords have done nothing but receive the rents. Their mistake has been that they have considered landlordism to be an essential factor in the social system. Following upon this is the belief in a kind of divine right to the first and largest fruits of the tenants' labour. Long terms of indolence and domination have created and fostered this mistake, this belief. Generation has followed generation, son after son has succeeded to the heritage of his fathers, and not one lord of the soil has had sufficient originality to ask himself the meaning of the system into which he has been born, to seek for its causes, its reasons, or to question its righteousness. The thing is so because it has always been so: it is the way of tenants to be poor and to get behindhand with their rents; it is my right, my business to receive rents and to do nothing! One cannot withhold sorrow and pity from such a spectacle. We do not reproach him for not building churches and model cottages, but for trying to obtain for himself the interest on the outlay of the tenants' capital. We do not hold him wholly responsible for the system itself, but we do hold him responsible for the attempt to graft the English rent-system upon the Irish tenants' outlay system. He is guilty of two pieces of injustice—(1) rent is charged on the tenants' improvements, and (2) improvements are confiscated on eviction.

Where does the responsibility lie? It does not apparently lie with the tenants. Is it the Government which forces the system upon unwilling and protesting landlords. Alas, poor human nature! is there never a landlord who knows how to be better than his system?

Take the case, for instance, of the hiring out of young children. "Priest and philanthropist have failed." True. "The landlord is powerless to achieve solid results." Alone, possibly, he is powerless; but what if the three were to work together? What if in this as in other matters man were not against man, class against class, creed against creed? What if the truth could be laid hold of that men are brothers, not each for himself, but all for one another, that encroachments on the rights of others means loss and suffering to self, that one cannot do good to his fellows without receiving of that good again? Then, indeed, would the wilderness be glad; and the desert would rejoice and blossom as the rose.

Since the foregoing was written, in September, the evicted tenants on the Olphert estate have been hard at work building houses for themselves on a plot of ground given for the purpose by the Rev.

James McFadden, the parish priest so tenderly enlogized by the writer of the Reply. The land, unfortunately, was not his own. He rented it from Mrs. Stewart. When the houses were nearly finished, a notice was served upon Father McFadden, not of ejectment, which would have been the usual course, but of threatening. If the work of building were not immediately stopped, the workmen should be arrested by the police. The work has accordingly ceased, but the matter is to be brought before the Petty Sessions Court at Falcarragh, and must be carefully watched also from this side of the water.

Mr. Olphert has been busy with evictions on a large scale. One of the evicted tenants was a son of James McGinley, and McGinley himself, fresh from gaol, was turned out with him. Two days afterwards James McGinley had to see his old house burned by the estate-agent and emergency-men, while the police stood by to protect them from possible harm. The house of another tenant, and the out-buildings of a third, were also fired and demolished. The local Conservative journal of the district knows nothing of the burning, but acknowledges the unroofing, and accounts for it in the following way:—"It is understood that Mr. Olphert has got these houses unroofed, and will get others unroofed, to save the taxation to which he would be liable if they remained standing." Yes, strict economy is necessary, even though the "eternal 'hat'" (my critic's phrase, not mine) has been going round for some time on behalf of a landlord who would rather have no rent at all than the fair rent offered by his tenants.

ELIZABETH MARTYN.

HOME AFFAIRS.

THE interval since we last wrote has not greatly changed the political situation. The Cabinet Councils have commenced, and at the time of writing a committee of Cabinet Ministers is sitting to consider certain special matters of importance. From the fact that both Lord Ashbourne and Mr. Balfour are members of this committee, it is naturally supposed that Irish affairs are in hand, and that some complicated legislative project is to the fore. But we know little. Ministers are strangely silent as to what they intend next year. Throughout last session they spoke freely of the great schemes which must occupy them in 1890—now they have nothing but vague phrases, which give the appearance of much hesitation and uncertainty as to their plans. Mr. Goschen, under pressure from Mr. Morley, says, with some obvious irritation, that we must wait for the Queen's Speech, and that in November Ministers have not had time to decide what matters they shall take up. This, of course, is much too artless to impose upon any one. Mr. Goschen, above all men, is committed to the promptest possible action in behalf of the Irish farmers. He, above all, has never ceased talking of what this most benevolent Government means to do for the sister country, putting it always on the high ground of duty and of conscience. Naturally, we call for the fulfilment of these imposing pledges. And really Mr. Goschen has left himself little opportunity of escape. He has been in Ireland lately, paying a round of visits to his landlord friends. They have shown him the best side of the local situation, and in one of his recent speeches he told us that "letters from Ireland assert that tenants have not exhibited such cheerful and pleasant faces for eleven years back." At Blackpool, too, he spoke confidently in contradiction of Mr. Gladstone at Southport, saying that derelict farms were fast going into occupation again, though he was careful to avoid giving figures or other details. Well, if this is the real state of affairs in Ireland, here is surely a blessed opportunity for Mr. Goschen to make his great venture. There is promise that he will be favourably placed in other respects. The revenue is yielding abundantly—much beyond what could have been expected—and it is quite on the cards that in April next he will have two or three millions of money to dispose of. A popular Budget ought to do much to float any other schemes which involve a financial risk. Yet

we have no confidence that Mr. Goschen will be able to discharge his high moral obligations.

Take, for instance, the Irish land question. At Dover, the other day, Mr. George Wyndham, who acts as private secretary to Mr. Balfour, was found telling the local Primrose League that the Chief Secretary intended next year to introduce a Bill which would give "a wide and large system of land purchase." Naturally this was hailed as an inspired revelation, and the Tory and Unionist Press, which had been hungering for something to place in contrast to the policy of pure coercion, paraded the project as a proof positive of the benevolent disposition of the Government towards Ireland. It was said at once that the Government had in hand a great scheme of compulsory purchase, and that finality was at length to be reached in regard to the troublesome Irish agrarian question. And once this was out of the way, Home Rule would be extinct. Alas, for the realization of human hopes! The "blessed word" compulsion had frightened the Irish Tories, and one of the Ulster members appealed to Mr. Balfour to know if his secretary had been speaking by the card. Mr. Balfour wrote cautiously, that there was nothing in Mr. Wyndham's speech which would at all "justify the fanciful conclusions built upon it by certain portions of the London Press." "There is not," he added, "the slightest justification for the extravagant anticipations so confidently made relative to the Government land purchase proposals, and those who build on the accuracy of these unauthorized forecasts are, I fear, doomed to disappointment." Yet at Manchester, a few days previously, the same Minister declared that the improvement in Ireland had exceeded his most sanguine hopes. "All the expectations he had formed of his Irish policy had been fulfilled, and more than fulfilled. The progress of Ireland had been steady and continuous, and he believed it would be permanent." Clearly Mr. Balfour's letter on Mr. Wyndham's speech ought to have confirmed the promise of a "wide and large system of land purchase"; but the Chief Secretary is Mr. Goschen over again, and worse, when one looks to him to pursue the ordinary and natural course of action. Lord Salisbury is less seductive, but more sincere, when he says, at the Lord Mayor's banquet, that it is "the merest fancy and the wildest legend" to suppose that "any portion of the Government, or of those who support the Government, have the faintest inclination to alter the policy to which they are already so deeply pledged."

The natural deduction from all this is pretty obvious. Without any great want of charity it may be put into this form: The Government are not certain of their capacity to deal with either of the greater Irish questions on a large scale. And they are not prepared, in the present temper of the constituencies, to risk a Parliamentary defeat which must involve a general election. Under the Septennial Act their natural term does not expire until the

autumn of 1892, and there is just a chance that the tide will turn in the interval. Mr. Gladstone is eighty years old this month ! They know they can be very little worse off in two or three years' time, and, as the sweets of office can be enjoyed meanwhile, they elect for the postponement of the day of reckoning to the last possible moment. It is so natural that we could hardly expect anything else, unless we have placed too much credence in the lofty professions of Mr. Goschen, and of that superior class of persons, the Liberal Unionists. The ordinary Tory goes in frankly for making the most out of the luck of his party. We know he will, if he can, hold on to the end. But your Liberal Unionist, with his superlatively high moral tone, will stick to his pledges or die. He, at any rate, will not allow poor Ireland to be made the sport of parties, but will do her justice. *Nous verrons.*

If this is a fair statement of the attitude of the Government and their allies—and we mainly put into evidence their words and actions—we shall see next session dawdled away in the passing of some minor measures which will not touch the real seat of mischief in Ireland. There must almost certainly be a Land Bill of some kind, for the reason that the last advance under Lord Ashbourne's Act is being rapidly exhausted. And to stop land purchase altogether is almost impossible. Latterly the Irish landowners have been in conference in the counties preparatory to their annual gathering in Dublin, and, so far as we have read, they have declared unanimously for a Bill on the lines of Lord Ashbourne's Act. They will not hear of a compulsory measure, and they want to see British money for their estates. Not a voice is heard in favour of Mr. Chamberlain's famous Land Bank buttressed by Irish credit. The scheme seems as dead as a door-nail. We hear, indeed, that Mr. Goschen has been praising it much in private to his Irish hosts, but he does not venture to make any public commendation of it, and we doubt if a Tory Government will ever have the courage to put it before their friends. They know, in advance, that it is certain of rejection. Hence the exact character of next year's Land Bill is almost sketched for us. There will be strong opposition to a mere extension of Lord Ashbourne's Act. The financial soundness of that scheme has been seriously challenged, and a sort of promise has been given that no further advance shall be asked for without a simultaneous strengthening of the guarantees. There are rumours afloat that the Government mean to tack on to the Bill clauses dealing effectively with arrears, and that they may also propose to take land by compulsory process for relieving the congested districts of the West. We sincerely hope that the Government will have the courage to take the provisions of the Scotch crofter legislation in regard to both these matters. They will do a great stroke for themselves if they give the Irish peasantry the benefits which have been given to the

West of Scotland; and their Bill will be one of very great value, though ranking somewhat below the first rank. It will be sure of a cordial welcome from the great majority of the House, and it ought to lighten materially the burden of governing Ireland. Two years ago a good Arrears Bill would have been a magnificent aid to Mr. Balfour, and we venture even now to predict for a really honest measure a great success. The crofter legislation has practically settled the islands and highlands of Western Scotland, and there is no reason why a similar policy should not have the same results in Ireland. We are not of those who think that the settlement of the agrarian question will destroy the claim for Home Rule. That is quite another matter, and finds no counterpart in the western districts of Scotland. But if a generous Land Bill would destroy Home Rule in Ireland, we should be disposed to pray for it night and day: For we confess that, though we are for Home Rule as matters stand, we only want it because it seems to us necessary for our own credit and for the peace and well-being of the sister island. As to the other legislative schemes of the Government there are absolutely no signs, though it is said with confidence that the Tithes Question, left over from last session, is to be taken up at an early date. Local Government for Ireland seems to have definitely receded into the background.

The first meeting of the Cabinet after the holidays took place the day before Ministers had to appear at Guildhall. The proceedings in the City were particularly flat. "The voice of truth and sense" was heard, no doubt, but we had no revelations. But a few days later Sir M. Hicks-Beach went with Mr. Goschen to the Colston Celebration at Bristol, and shot a bolt from the blue. The President of the Board of Trade seems to be filled with apprehension for the future. The "New Radicalism" scares him almost as much as it does Mr. Chamberlain. At Bristol he drew a terrible picture of the dangers it had for the State. And this brought him to make open invitation to the Liberal Unionists to join the Government. "He ventured to express the fervent hope that by the time the general election came, the two parties now enrolled under the Unionist banner would be fused into one. The people could not understand the meaning of a third party in the State, and, inasmuch as the Government had done more in the direction of social and political reform than any Government that had preceded it, he could only see one thing that stood in the way of complete union—the question of a name." Sir Michael went on to say he felt the difficulty of a Liberal Unionist taking kindly to the name of Tory, and he proposed that they should all stick to their present nomenclature, and generally call themselves the Unionist party. So far as he knew, there was absolutely no great public question on which the two wings of the party were at issue, while on all the great social questions of the day—the improvement

of working-men's dwellings, the abolition of the evils of sweating, and the extension of factory legislation—they could certainly act as one man. Sir Michael seemed to have clean forgotten there was such a person as Mr. Chamberlain in the world. The Member for Birmingham has gone far on the Tory road, but we take it he is still in favour, say, of Disestablishment. So it came about that Mr. Goschen had to remind his colleague of the existence of the Member for West Birmingham and his "family party." "What," asked Mr. Goschen, "would the Radical Unionists say?" For himself, he thought it was a question rather for the rank and file than for the leaders of the party, since the rank and file were likely to be particularly touchy on the matter of a change of name. We have a strong suspicion that Mr. Goschen is right. The rank and file are a steadily decreasing quantity, and caution is eminently necessary. So far they have shown the liveliest repugnance to being classed as Tories, and we cannot believe that they will consent to wear the motley of the Unionist faction much longer. But it is when one comes to ask who prompted Sir M. Hicks-Beach to give his invitation that the subject becomes really interesting. Did he act upon a hint from Lord Salisbury? And was he, so far from forgetting Mr. Chamberlain, actually replying to the recent proposal of that gentleman for the formation of a great national party? If either of these suggestions is true, we may have some remarkable changes before long. The necessity of winning the next general election is, to the Unionists, overwhelming, and we may be sure that they will take any and every step that promises them advantage in that regard. Hence, spite of Lord Hartington's repeated declarations that he finds it easier to support the Government from the Opposition side of the House, coalition may come. When it does come, Mr. Chamberlain's views on Disestablishment will not stand in the way. He has proposed fusion, and, if Lord Salisbury takes him at his word, he can hardly be otherwise than extremely complaisant. At present the majority of Tory members of Parliament are hostile to fusion, but their objections are purely selfish, and if the Prime Minister gives the order they must submit.

The month has been crowded with political speeches, but the great matter of controversy has not made much progress. It would appear, however, that the Liberal Unionists have now been able to grasp the fact that the retention of the Irish members at Westminster is to be clearly laid down in the next Home Rule Bill. They were desperately set on having this put broadly before the country. Now that they have gained their point, they are falling foul of it, as was predicted. We hear from all sides that this "settles the matter"—that the new Bill will be worse than the old—that the thing is ridiculous and absurd—and that if we were conquered by the Irish we could not have more humiliating conditions put upon us. That the Irish should manage their affairs without our interference, and

still be able to vote down English and Scotch members on English and Scotch affairs, is, according to our critics, quite outrageous. They have, indeed, no language which will properly describe it. Of course this is controversy gone mad. So far we have laid down the principle only. How, and in what measure, it shall be qualified in action is yet to be decided. The Unionists, however, have precious little right to their present amplitude of criticism. There are among them men whose chief, if not only, objection to Mr. Gladstone's Bill was that it destroyed the unity of the Imperial Parliament by excluding the Irish members. With what face can these persons pretend to criticize a concession made to their demands? Mr. Chamberlain may lay this question to heart. As a matter of fact, the Unionist party is a mere party of faction upon the question of Home Rule; and to think of conciliating them by surrender of any sort is the merest delusion. We must keep our own counsel until the period for effective action arrives, and this will be when we are face to face with a general election.

As to the speeches made on our own side, a word ought to be said of the extreme lucidity and cogency of Mr. Gladstone's impeachment of the Crimes Act at Southport. The right hon. gentleman has rarely done anything better than this. His exposition of the extraordinary powers of the Irish Executive, and of the dangers which they involve to public freedom, was most masterly, and we only wish that the speech had been heard by the whole country. The formulation of the more general policy of the party Mr. Gladstone is content to leave to younger men. We all know that Lord Rosebery has his special confidence, and it is therefore interesting to see what the noble earl has to say on this all-important matter. He also was at the Colston Celebration at Bristol, and he took occasion to sketch in outline the kind of work which would fall to the next Liberal Administration. Let us put on record his own words:—

"It would probably be the business of the next Liberal Government to deal with the Irish question, but that was only one plank in their platform. They asked for the country's confidence not merely on the Irish question, but as being the most faithful interpreters of the wishes of the nation in matters of domestic legislation. More especially did they claim it as being the most faithful interpreters of the wishes of the great mass of the population to whom they gave the suffrage in 1884. The Liberal programme was not complete for the next election, but they were rather more forward with one than their opponents. (Cheers.) Among other subjects from which it would be selected were the liquor traffic, land reform, registration, abolition of the plurality of votes, shorter Parliaments—(cheers)—the payment of members, the London programme, disestablishment in Scotland and Wales—(cheers)—a drastic reform of the Second Chamber, free education, and the group of questions under the head of working-men's questions. With this last named the Liberal party would have to deal more seriously now, or they would find them dealt with by a separate school and by different methods."

Mr. John Morley has also been speaking on the party pro-

gramme. At Newcastle the local Socialists put him through an extensive catechism on various points of "the new charter." Mr. Morley was good enough to enter on the "steeplechase," as he called it, and he frankly declared that he was "dead against" an Eight Hours Bill, the acquisition of railways and other means of transit by the State, and the nationalization of the land, which would be either "folly or robbery," as the State paid or did not pay. As to State insurance, he was studying the legislation of the German Reichstag on this matter, and wanted time to consider it; but he was for "adult suffrage," and for a better inspection of factories and workshops. To the Eighty Club Mr. Morley has since defined afresh the limits of socialism in legislation. He puts the matter in this form:—

"If Socialism is the same thing as Communism; if it means the abolition of private property; if it means the assumption by the State of the land—an assumption and administration of all land and capital; if it means an equal distribution of products—I say that that is against human nature, and could only produce convulsion and disaster. But if Socialism means a wise use of the forces of all for the good of each; if it means the legal protection of the weak against the strong; if it means the performance by public bodies of duties which individuals could not perform either as well or not at all for themselves; why, then, the principles of Socialism are admitted all over the field of our social activity, and it is absurd—it is too late—at this time of day for a country with such a system of poor law as we have, such a system of factory legislation as we have—it is too late to use the term of Socialist as a particular term of reproach."

Having thus given his definition, Mr. Morley elaborated still further his Newcastle profession of faith. He suggests that Mr. Goschen should give us with his surplus next April a free breakfast table; and, whilst he is against the provision by the State of free meals for school children, he thinks this might be done by the local authorities, who know best the local necessities. To municipal and other local bodies, indeed, he would give many new powers. They should have the right of acquiring land at a reasonable rate for public purposes; he would increase their authority for dealing with the housing of the poor, and, of course, he would give them the regulation and control of the drink traffic. He approves of the principle that a property owner who benefits by public improvement should be specially taxed for this "betterment"—(the London County Council have put the principle into a Bill); that vacant land (of which there is in Kensington alone a value of £1,700,000) should be rated—that the capital value of land apart from the rent should bear its quota to the State. To do this most effectually he suggests that there should be a full reform of the death duties, so that land and personalty, freehold and leasehold property, should be placed on an absolutely equal footing. Then we must recognize the parish for the purpose of local administration, and set up a cheap and

effective process that will enable the parish councils to purchase or hire land for letting. As to Poor Law relief, he thinks "there is something very terrible in a system by which, when a man, who has laboured and toiled all his life, grows old and infirm, and can toil no more, he is treated as if he had broken the laws, with the result that his home is broken up, his children taken away from him, and he, who would work but cannot, is bundled off into the workhouse with the ne'er-do-weels who could work but will not." Here the parish councils might probably do useful work by settling lists of persons to be relieved, there being a reference, of course, to the superior district or county authority, and a right of surcharge in the latter for any excess of relief upon those who gave it. Mr. Morley was careful to say that he did not commit himself to this, but put it forward as a matter for consideration. Finally, he addressed himself to the labour question, in the fashion with which we are familiar. He declares that wages are the great master-key of all social improvement of the masses at this stage, and he is full of sympathy for all "these stirring demands of the underpaid kinds of labour for shorter hours or better pay." But of a statutory eight hours' working day he will hear nothing, for reasons with which we have already been made acquainted. We have thought it worth while to deal thus in detail with the proposals and suggestions which have emanated from the leading lieutenants of Mr. Gladstone, as showing the direction of future Liberal policy. We cannot say that we accept without reserve every item of this very comprehensive programme. We hear much of the virtues of Municipal as opposed to State Socialism. But we do not ourselves quite understand the force of a logic which shudders at the proposal to appropriate the taxes and is yet quite willing to utilize the rates. If Socialism is good for the Municipality, it can hardly be seriously hurtful to the State. Again, we do not think that Mr. Morley quite adheres to his definition; at any rate, we should say he is straining it. We do not ourselves admit it is "a wise use of the forces of all for the good of each" to allow Municipalities to serve dinners to school children. We prefer Mr. Morley's suggestion to the Newcastle Socialists that this matter of feeding the children should be left to voluntary agency. And then we want some clearer statement of Lord Rosebery's views in dealing "more seriously now" with the group of questions under the head of working-men's questions. With these reserves, however, we find plenty of excellent material in the suggestions thrown out by the two statesmen for the construction of a very effective party "platform" from which to fight the next general election.

The London Liberal and Radical Union are, indeed, not content. They would force upon us the eight hours day. We cannot believe that they have fully reflected on this matter, and, so far, we have only the opinion of the Council. But if the Council really answers for

the Liberal and Radical Clubs, then we foresee much difficulty ahead. Apart from this, we cannot profess to be surprised at the alarms of Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, and if we did not know what Mr. Chamberlain himself has proposed, we might almost be willing to forgive the reckless fling concerning "the Nihilists of English politics." The pace is quickening amazingly, but the man who expects things to go on as they did in the pre-Reform Bill days must be strangely insensible to the forces which we have lately let loose among us.

In Ireland public attention is still much engaged with the quarrel of Mr. Smith-Barry and his Tipperary tenants. The attitude of the latter is so unbending that it has forced certain unwilling members—including a Protestant—into the combination, and Mr. Smith-Barry finds his November rent generally withheld from him. He is consequently talking of eviction, and this is met, by those who are leading the tenants, with promises to erect houses and to find a maintenance for "the victims." The Ponsonby estate at Youghal is, it seems, to be "cleared." The negotiations for a settlement have finally broken down, and Canon Keller and those who are acting with him are preparing to erect some two hundred houses on the frontiers of the estate for the reception of the tenants who are to be turned out of their holdings. Mr. Smith-Barry, who has had many protests from his Tipperary people for the part which he has taken at Youghal, again defends himself by saying that he has never advised the rejection of terms that "in my opinion seemed fair to both parties." The offers made to Mr. Ponsonby on behalf of the tenants had, however, been such that he had been quite unable to accede to them. The best friends of the tenants would be those who induced them to save themselves from eviction by settling on the terms offered by Mr. Ponsonby in April and renewed in August. Unfortunately, the tenants do not admit either the generosity or justness of these terms, and as they have now behind them the full strength of the new Tenants' Defence Association, which has been formally launched in half a dozen counties, including Cork, there is every prospect that the quarrel will run to an acute crisis. With Youghal and Tipperary in ferment, and with fresh evictions going forward on the Clanricarde estate, we enter upon the winter with a certain uneasiness which one wishes were absent. It is a stroke of luck for the Government that Mr. William O'Brien, M.P., who started the Tipperary protest, should have declined to enter into recognizances, and has elected to serve another term of two months' imprisonment in Galway Gaol. All the same, the authority of the Executive has little weight in this matter, since, to use the language of Archbishop Croke, the tenants can defy the law by carefully refraining from breaking it. At Maryborough the Executive had a really bad fall. Neither the provision of special

jurors occupying property of the annual value of £100 a year, nor the exclusion of Catholics, could wring a verdict of murder against the Gweedore peasants. A Protestant jury found one Coll guilty of manslaughter, but a jury consisting of eleven Protestants and one Catholic disagreed in the next case, and then there was a complete collapse. The Judge had laid it down that any person who had engaged in any way in the attack upon the police when Inspector Martin was killed was technically guilty of manslaughter, and counsel for the defence, accepting this rule, thought to save their clients by arranging a submission. The Attorney-General was naturally willing to come to terms, and it was agreed that "of nine persons (excluding Coll) returned on the capital charge, three were to go home free, although against one of these evidence of direct violence to Mr. Martin was set out in the depositions; that three others were to plead guilty of misdemeanour, involving sentences of a few months' imprisonment; and that three were to plead guilty to manslaughter, on the understanding that mitigated punishment only would be inflicted; that as regards twelve men returned on minor charges, about half were to be discharged; and that finally Father McFadden was to admit a technical offence—obstructing the police—and be discharged on his own recognizances." Of course the Judge was no party to the arrangement, and, having given Coll ten years, he sent two others to seven years' and one to five years' penal servitude, which seems sufficiently severe. The other cases were, however, lightly dealt with, and Father McFadden escaped with a lecture in addition to his bond. After this, one naturally asks why he was thrown into prison and charged with murder? There was not, from the first, the ghost of a reason for it, and it seems to us that the rev. gentleman has in equity, if not in law, the strongest possible claim for compensation for this outrage. The Unionist prints profess to be satisfied with the result of the trials, and talk of "the ample vindication of the law." Well, they are content with small mercies. In Ireland there has been some division of opinion in Nationalist circles as to the wisdom of the advice which dictated a plea of guilty, but the Macdermot and Mr. T. Healy, M.P., were among the counsel for the defence, and their sagacity in such a matter may be absolutely trusted. During the trials there were some further evictions in the Gweedore district, and we may take it that the Executive does not count many friends to-day in this district of Donegal.

ERRATA.

On page 1 of cover of the last October number of the WESTMINSTER REVIEW, for "By Lewis G. James" read "By Lewis G. *James*."

In the same number, at page 415, tenth line from bottom, for "*fatuitous*" read "*fortuitous*;" and at page 421, eighteenth line from top, for "*virtually*" read "*vitality*."

